

BONASUS VAPULANS:

O R,

Some Castigations given to Mr. *John Durell*, for fouling himself and others in his English and Latin Book.

By a Country Scholar. *Mr. Hen:
Hickman* ~~pr: Mr. et Coll. Magd: olim~~
Anno. 1660. / Socius.

+



LONDON,
Printed in the Year, 1672.

Line.
8° A. 115.

(115)

BONASUS VAPULANS:

O R,

Some Castigations given to Mr. *John Durell*, for fouling himself and others in his English and Latin Book.

By a Country Scholar. *Mr. Hen:
Hickman* *Art: Mr. & Cott. Magd. olim*
Anno. 1660. / Socius.

+



LONDON,
Printed in the Year, 1672.

ERRATA.

Page 3. l. 25. r. *reprovet* p. 12. l. 15. r. *beav*. p. 13. l. 16. r. *has* p. 16. l. 7. r. *whether*. p. 21. l. 18. r. *nor should have*. p. 26. l. 26. r. *Phrases*. In ens. p. 28. l. 21. r. *Salmurimfes* p. 30. l. 17. r. *eperous*. p. 39. l. 25. & 41. l. 10. r. *Nonconformist*. p. 44. l. 22. r. *That*; & l. ult. r. *there is*. p. 49. l. antepen. r. *the more*. p. 53. l. 11. r. *Tithes*. p. 59. l. ult. r. *bring us*. p. 63. l. 25. r. *there called* p. 64. l. 26. r. *world*. p. 72. l. 21. r. *was*. l. 25. r. *Aquila*. p. 79. l. 1. r. *of such*. l. 9. r. *strongly*. l. 17. r. *Episcopacy* p. 94. l. 26. r. *Consecration*, though p. 114. l. 7. r. *there* p. 119. l. 3. r. *all* p. 128. l. 3. r. *in* p. 136. l. 20. r. *Ecclēsie* p. 138. l. 20. r. *down*; and p. 145. l. 13. r. *will find* p. ult. l. 10. r. *in the behalf of* l. 11. r. *done*. *yea will*.





S I R,

I have of late so wholly addicted my self to practical Theology, and taken so huge a pleasure, in reading those Authors that never espoused the petty interest of the Times, that next to wishing for Mr. Durell's sake, his Eristical volume had never been written, I wish for my own sake you had never sent it me, or at least sent it me under such circumstances, that I might have laid it down as soon as it had given me enough of it, *i. e.* as soon as I had read the Title page. Certainly if you had left me to pay the Stationer for it, if I had not returned it, it should only have stood in my Library, to encrease the number of my Books: nor should I have ever taken it down, unless when I take down *Bonarascius* his *Amphitheatrum*, *i. e.* when I have a mind to discover unto my self, or others, unto what a height of bitterness, corrupt nature, not restrained by Grace, will transport men even in controversies relating to Religion; which of all others require to be managed with exemplary moderation and meekness: but

seeing you have thought meet to be so bountiful as to bestow a Book on me, which must needs cost you sundry shillings: and seeing you have desired of me (for a requital of your cost and charges) to throw away some time upon it, I should be extreamly uncivil and unthankful, if I should not bestow a few hours in reading of it, or so much of it, as may be sufficient to pass a judgement upon the whole, the which yet I cannot so well do, until I have first given my censure of that English Treatise printed, 1662 the answering whereof in a Latin Apology for the Nonconformists, has produced these voluminous *Vindicie*, and of that Treatise my censure in brief is this, that a Nonconformist cannot better secure himself against it, then by standing at the mark, at the which its Author pretends to shoot all his Arrows; The controversies betwixt Conformists and Non-Conformists being brought to their true State, it will appear that Mr. *Durell* either never knew them, or was afraid to come near them: To instance in a few particulars of many.

Several hundreds of Ministers during the late distractions, were ordained by meer Presbyters, they only having courage enough to confer orders publickly, and solemnly with *Fasting, Prayer and imposition of hands*: None
of

of these would the Bishops admit to Ecclesiastical employment, unless they would submit to be re-ordained with and by that very form of Ordination, which is used for the Translating of Laicks into the state of Clergymen: Here two Questions arise, first, Whether a valid Ordination may be repeated? and that the far greater part as well of Conformists, as Non-Conformists deny: the second therefore and only remaining Question is, Whether an Ordination by meer Presbyters be valid? if it be not, we nullifie the most famous Churches beyond the Seas, whom God has so remarkably owned and supported amid all the troubles and persecutions of their Popish Adversaries; if it be valid, then by the judgement even of the very Conformists, no other Ordination can be received: Mr. *Durell* was unwilling to annihilate those Churches in which he was baptized, and yet was as unwilling to justify the English Presbyterians in not submitting to Re-ordination, and therefore wisely passed over these Questions in silence; but being by the Latin Apologist reprove for omitting so Capital a controverſie, he grows more hardy, and adventures to affirm the Case of the Presbyterians beyond the Sea, and those in *England*, is not the same: because among them there are no Bishops, as among ours there

were, and so they are defended by necessity, which ours cannot plead. How much better had it been to have left this fore naked and exposed to the Eyes of all, than to have used a Plaister that can neither Cure, nor cover it? Is the Case of Transmarine and English Presbyterians so vastly different? Why is the same hard measure meeted out to both? How comes it to pass, that if a man ordained at *Rome*, could obtain leave of himself to assent and consent, he were capable of the highest Ecclesiastical dignities: but if a man were ordained at *Geneva*, the most unfeigned assent and consent will not qualify him for Ecclesiastical dignities, unless he will also receive new Orders. Was it so from the beginning either of our first or second Reformattons? were any of those, that either in the persecutions of King *Henry* the eight, or Queen *Mary*, fled beyond the Seas, and received orders in reformed Churches, looked upon at their return as meer Lay-men? our Histories tell us they were not: nor would the right Reverend and Learned Bishop *Morton* so far scandalize the Neighbour Churches, as to re-ordain one of their Ministers, though strongly importuned so to do, by a Letter of the dissembling Archbishop of *Spalato*. Nor could Bishop *Bancroft* be induced to give way, that the Scotch Divines should first be made Priests before

vid. Spottwoods History of Scotland they
pag. 514.

they were Bishops, although it was alleadged that they had never been made Priests, but by Presbyters. So as this custom of Presbyterizing *de novo* those that before had received the gift of Presbytery, must needs be an innovation here in *England*: of the which I wish I could give a more fair and plausible account unto Forreigners, then for the present I am able ; For it would greatly dishearten those renowned Ministers abroad, who live under a King of a different Religion from them, to come over to our Nation for a Sanctuary, if they must when come hither, break the Seal that God hath set to their Ministry, before they be admitted to any cure of Souls.

2. I say this pretended difference is no difference at all, for what though there were Bishops in *England*, yet did they not appear to magnifie their offices And it hath been wont to be accounted the same thing not to be, and not to appear : and if they had appeared, their appearance might perhaps make those Presbyters who gave orders without them *Schismaticks*, it could not possible make their orders null: for as formerly where our Church thought that Baptisme administred by a Midwife was valid, and allowed and enjoyned her in Case of necessity to baptize, the Midwife had offended, if she had baptized where there was no true necessity; yet this

offence notwithstanding, her baptisme would have been reputed valid : so here, if our Presbyters could confer a valid Ordination, when Bishops were not at hand, their Ordination must needs be *valid*, though Bishops were at hand; & therefore all the dust that is raised by Mr. *D.* to shew some difference between the Presbyters of our own and other Churches, could be designed to no other end, but to blind his own and his Readers Eyes, that so no notice might be taken how he got off this controverſie : it may be he may come nearer the mark in the point of Episcopacy it ſelf, but of that alſo we ſhall find that his Arrows fall Heavenly wide : For the Non-Conformiſt has again and again profeſſed in conference and writing, that he can and would for peaceſake receive a Biſhop, that ſhould have as great a ſuperintendence over Presbyters as ever *Cyprian* had over his, but they ſay that by aſſenting and conſenting to the preſent Book of Ordination, they muſt acknowledge a Biſhop to be by *divine Inſtitution*, of a *ſuperiour order* to a *Presbyter*; and for this they ſay they can find no Foundation in Scripture, and leſs then none in any writings of modern reformed Divines : If they are miſtaken either in ſetting our Biſhops higher then they have ſet themſelves, or in making a Biſhop when ſet to ſuch a heighth, to be an Officer

Officer unknown to Primitive or Modern Churches, Mr. *Durell* had done a very Christian work: if he had taken pains in the Spirit of meekness, to shew them their mistake: but he cannot sure think that he hath endeavoured any such thing: He tells us page "4th. and the 5th. that all the *Lutheran* Churches have a subordination of Pastours, "and that those who are in them called Superintendents, or Bishops, have the power "of Ordination as the Bishops of the Church "of *England* have.

But does he believe what he himself writes? does he not know that they all found their Superintendency on a human and not on a divine institution? does he not know that some *Lutheran* Divines of eminent note, do with full mouth declaim against us here in *England*, because we so much appropriate the power of Ordination unto Bishops? *Tobias Major* I am sure on this very score calls us *Angli Papizantes*: let all Scholars consult *Chemnitius*, *Gerard*, *Brockmand*, or any other *Lutheran* that writes common places, or if they be too many to consult, let them consult *Hunnius's* demonstration of the *Lutheran* Ministry, in which they shall find him, though himself a Superintendent, making a Bishop in Ordination to act only as the Churches instrument; and averring, that if the Church should delegate

gate her power to a Presbyter, or to a Layman, the Ordination would be as valid, as if performed by a Bishop. The Non-Conformists have no quarrel against the *name*, either of Superintendent or Bishop, nor will it be any satisfaction to them, to shew them Ecclesiastical Persons in the *Lutheran* Churches, dignified by the name of Superintendents or Episcopi, unless it could also be shewed, that they claim that dignity by divine right, and are received by the Elders, as an *Order* of men superiour to them: the which will never be shewed: nay it will easily be proved, that meer Presbyters have ordained those who in *Germany* and *Denmark* go by the name of Bishops and Super-intendents: *Nicholas Amsdorft*, as appears in his Life written by *Melchior Adam*, was created Bishop; but by whom was he created? by *Martin Luther* the Pastour of the place where the Ordination was solemnized, and two Pastours more. Now did these set this Bishop into an order superiour to their own? if they did, who gave them authority so to do? if they did not, then his Title notwithstanding he was still of the *Order* of Presbyters, and those that were afterwards ordained by him, were ordained but by a Presbyter. Likewise in *Denmark* when Reformation there first began, seven Bishops of the Kingdome being cast out, there

there were seven Superintendents ordained, who were to do the work of the expelled Bishops, and to be Executors of the whole Ecclesiastical Ordination; but by whom were these seven ordained? even by *John Bugenhagh*, who was but a Presbyter, as may be seen in his Life, written by the forementioned Author; so that such Episcopacy as is scrupled by the English Non-Conformist, has no place in any *Lutheran Churches*: and if not in the *Lutheran*, I am sure not in the reformed Churches.

Yet Mr. *Durell* in many places of his Book, makes shew as if the Episcopacy quarrelled against here in *England*, had place in some reformed Churches, and that those very Churches among whose Ministers there is an equality, do not condemn Episcopal Government: the French Churches he is certain page 13. "*are so far from averseness to it, that they rather wish they were in a condition to enjoy that sacred order.*"

Now what means he by that *sacred Order*? if he do not mean an Order by Divine appointment, superiour to the order of Presbytery, he doth most egregiously trifle; If he do mean such an Order, I say that as many French Divines as do desire such an Order, are manifestly fallen off from the confession exhibited to *Charles 9th. 1561. the 30th. Article* whereof is this. We

“ We believe that all true Pastours in what
 “ place so ever they are set, are all endued with
 “ the same and equal power among them-
 “ selves, under that one head and chief and
 “ sole universal Bishop Jesus Christ. And
 if any Ministers of the Belgick Churches do
 either desire or could approve of the English
 Hierarchy, they also must fall off from the Bel-
 gick Confession, which in the Synod of *Dort*
 was reviewed and approved: for if that Con-
 fession, had no inimicous aspect upon the
 Church Government in *Britain*, why did
 our Divines of *England* approve only that
 part of it, which related to Doctrine, not
 that which related to Discipline?

Our Prelates and their Friends in *England*
 do very much build their Hierarchy upon *Ignatius*
 his Epistles. If the French Churches
 did not dislike the building, why do the most
 Learned of them take so much pains to ruine
 and pull up the Foundation? why have *Blon-*
del, *Salmasius*, *Dally*, so long employed their
 Pens to prove the Epistles even in the best E-
 dition to be spurious; I know Mr. *Durell* tells
 a story concerning *Blondel*, that in his Apo-
 logy for the opinion of *Hierom*, he had insert-
 ed a passage, which some Scotch Ministers
 prevailed with him to blot out: in which he
 declares himself to be no Enemy unto Primi-
 tive Episcopacy: if that be true, he did not
 sure

sure think our Episcopacy to be Primitive, for Doctor *Hammond* in his Answer to *Blondel* complains of him, *as if he were so far from being touched with any care of our Church, or sense of our miseries, that he thought meet contrariy more sharply to prick those that were already oppressed, and endeavoured to triumph over our Church when it was sick and staggering, and ready by reason of inward troubles to give up the Ghost*; let Mr. *Durell* now consider, whether he will make his Countryman *Blondell* an Enemy to our Hierarchy, or make our Countryman Dr. *Hammond* a Calumniator; one of the two he must unavoidably do: And for the future let him bethink himself how to wipe off that great and black blot, which he hath let fall upon some of the best and most obedient of the Sons of the Church of *England*, page 2. “*viz.* that they *weakly* suffered themselves “to be brought into a bad and false opinion “of the Transmarine reformed Churches, “merely by the reports given them by the “new Presbyterians.

For certainly it is little to their credit, when they had the Confessions and Symbolical Books of the reformed Churches in their Libraries, never to consult them, but to take up reports concerning their Neighbours, from Men, whose interest did lead them to make the world believe, that they had a many Friends a-
broad,

broad, though but few at home. Doubtless our Episcopal Divines knew well enough, that the Hierarchy they aimed at was not countenanced by Sister Churches ; and long before *Smectymnus* was heard of, or ever such a creature as an Ordinance of Lords and Commons saw the light, one among us had said publicly, *perfecto odio odi. Calvinum* : and Bishop *Land* had inured his tongue to say *Ecclesia Romana*, and *Turba Genevensis* : he had also told Bishop *Hall*, that though he did well to put a difference betwixt the Scottish and other Churches, yet he had written more favourably even of other Churches, than their cause would then bare; and the good cause then in hand did work so powerfully even upon the Holy and Learned Bishop *Hall* himself, that he adventured, as Mr. *Prin* tells us, to reordain Mr. *John Dury*, though he had been before ordained in some Reformed Church. Such an Episcopacy as was claimed by Arch-bishop *Cranmer*, the far greater part at least of present Non-Conformists could admit but such an Episcopacy as Arch-bishop *Land* was introducing they cannot yet digest, and that is the Episcopacy that the present book of Ordination, if assented and consented unto, would engage us in : and let it not seem strange that the present Non-Conformists startle at it, when as Dr. *Holland* the

Kings

Kings professour of Divinity in *Oxford*, was so much offended with Dr. *Land* for asserting it, that he did not stick to affirm he was a Schismatick, and went about to make a Division betwixt the English and other Reformed Churches: yet though the Non-Conformists do not like such a kind of Hierarchy, they will if they consult the peace of their Consciences, use no such incivil language against it as some of Mr. *Durells* Countrymen have done: they will not be so uncivil as to call Dr. *Hammond* Knave, which is the English to *Salmasius* his *Nebulo*: they will not say as *Maresius* does in his Examen of Dr. *Prideaux* his four Questions, pag. 1. "That Dr. *Hammond* "as proceeded to such a degree of fury, as "professedly to propugne the cause of the Pope. "Much less will they say that the English Bishops had better consulted their eminence, "if they had acted more moderately in it, "and had rather with the rest of Protestants "made it to be of humane institution, than "so stiffly to assert the *jus divinum* of it: for "as a bow by too much bending of it is "broken, so they too much stretching their "Authority and dignity fell, quite from it, "like the Camel in the Fable, who because "he affected horns lost his ears, pag. 68. least of all will they say, as the same Author says pag. 71. (which I tremble to English) "*Presules*

sules Angli ex parte collimarunt ad Papi-
smi restitutionem jure postliminii: and pag.
 III. *Ut dicam quod res est, hac defensio tem-*
poralis Jurisdictionis pro Ecclesie Ministris por-
tio aliqua est illius fermenti Papistici quo Hie-
rarchia Anglicana massa paulatim se infici
passa fuit, dum magis ambit Typhum Seculi,
quam humilitatem Crucis meditatur.

To conclude all, when the Learned *Gata-*
ker was most bitterly railed upon by *Lilly* for
 being a Presbyterian, he answers in his Apo-
 logy, pag. 24. "A duly bounded and well
 "regulated Prelacy, joyned with a Presbyte-
 "ry, wherein one as President, Superinten-
 "dent, Moderator (term him what you
 "please) whether Annual or Occasional, or
 "more constant and continual, either in re-
 "gard of years or parts, or both jointly, hath
 "some preheminaence above the rest, yet so,
 "as that he do nothing without joint consent
 "of the rest: Such a Prelacy I never durst,
 "nor yet dare condemn. The like he says for
 divers others, if not the greater part of the
 Assembly, pag. 26. And the same dare I ad-
 venture to say, in reference to the far greater
 part of the present suffering Ministers; nay I
 may further undertake for them, that if any
 one should publish in print, that the difference
 betwixt a Bishop and Presbyter is by divine
 institution, they would not think themselves
 any

any way concerned to have such a one suspended from his Ministry : yet if my memory greatly fail me not, Mounſieur *Peter Moulin* in his first Epistle to Bishop *Andrews*, making Apology for some passages in his Tract of the Vocation of Pastors, excepted against by K. *James*, useth these or the like words ; That if he had made the difference betwixt a Bishop and Presbyter to be founded on a divine Law, his own Churches would have inflicted Ecclesiastical censures upon him.

It will concern Mr. *Duwell* highly, either to prove that *Moulin* wronged his own Churches, or that they have abated of their zeal against Episcopacy ; for if he prove neither of these, he will lose (that which is better then all his Ecclesiastical revenues) a good name, and when his hand is in at this work, he may also do well to take Bishop *Mountague* to task, who in his appeal to *Cesar* by his Majesties special direction and command perused by Dr. *White*, and approved as fit to be Printed, says p. 70. "That the Discipline of the Church of *England* in the Synod of *Dort*, and other *Dutch Synods* is held unlawful.

If it be held unlawful in the Synod of *Dort*, it may be presumed it was held unlawful by almost all other Reformed Churches ; for, almost all sent thither their Delegates : and these Delegates approved the confession of

B

Faith,

Faith, in which onely the Discipline of our Church can be thought to be condemned. Now let Mr. *Durell* bid his zeal awake, for certainly *Hannibal est ad portas* : either he or Bishop *Mountague* will be found false witnesses against the Reformed Churches, I will not determine whither must be branded for a Calumninator. Bishop *Carleton* hath written an examination of *Mountagues* appeal, And pag. III. gives us to understand, "That instead
 " of yielding his consent to that strange conceit of the parity of Ministers to be instituted by Christ, which was inserted into
 " the Belgick Confession ; he openly protested his dissent thereunto : And I believe that
 such protestation was by him made in his own name, and the name of those sent out of *England* with him. But I would willingly be satisfied, why the Divines of other Churches did not make such protestation also ? Did they think the parity of Ministers a strange conceit ? If they did not , down falls the whole structure of Mr. *Durells* Book : if they did, why did they enter no dissent to this strange conceit ? And I would also be satisfied , what might move our Reverend and Learned *Carleton* to say, That the cause of all the troubles in the Belgick Church was this, That they had not Bishops amongst them, who by their Authority might repress those
 who

who brought in novelties. Sure I am, that not long after the sitting of that Synod, the *Arminian* novelties were broached to purpose in *England*, and yet we who wanted not Bishops, either would not, or could not, repress the broachers of them. This Reverend Prelate was *Diocesan* to Mr. *Mountague*, who made it his business to infect us with *Arminianism*: If his Episcopal power were so sovereign an Antidote against the spreading of this infection, why did he never make use of it? or how came it to have so little success? Oh that it were not too manifest, that errors may grow in a Reformed Church where Hierarchy is established.

I have one thing more to add which it may not be amiss here to relate. The Ministers of the Palatinate being brought into a great deal of distress, his late Majesty thought meet under the Broad Seal, to grant them a Collection here in *England* for their Relief. The Letters Patents being Sealed, Archbishop *Laud* thought meet to have an Alteration made, in the form of the Letters, and obtained of the King to have it made. It had been said, that the Ministers extream miseries fell upon them for their sincerity and constancy in the true Religion, which we together with them profess, and because they would not submit themselves to the Antichristian yoke: our most Re-

verend Primate thought not meet to have Popery call'd the Antichristian Yoke, though it had been so called here in *England* by Persons as great as himself. Nor did it relish with him, that the Religion of the Palatinate Churches should be called the same with ours. Dr. *Heylin* in the History of his Life, pag. 306. gives the reason: "Because by the Religion of those Churches the *Calvinian* rigors about Predestination, &c. are received as Orthodox, and because they maintain a parity of Ministers directly contrary both to the Doctrine and Government of the Church of *England*. Either therefore what Mr. *Durell* saith from the Palatinate Ministers in favour of our *English* Hierarchy is a meer falsity, or else there is some such Alteration made in the Judgment of those men of late, as the world formerly knew not of; or else the Archbishop and his Second laid to the charge of the Palatinate Ministers, what they were not truly to be charged with.

I have insisted too long on this point, and shall conclude it with a profession of my persuasion, that if a *Synod* should be called, made up of the most sober forreign Divines, they would advise his Majesty to establish a moderated, limited Episcopacy, as more suited to the Generality of our English tempers, than that Presbytery which the two Houses,

to satisfy the importunities of the Sects, rather made a shew they would establish, then did establish : but I can as soon believe they would publish to the whole world their own Hypocrisie, as advise to settle a Government by Bishops, pretending to be *Jure Divino*, superiour to the Presbyters, claiming sole power of Order and Jurisdiction and exercising their Jurisdiction by Lay-Chancellors : and if they would not advise this, much less would they advise to silence every one that should not assent to, and approve of such a Government. If you can think that Mr. *Durells* Testimonies prove they would ; I beseech you then make use of your Logick, reduce his Testimonies into the form of a Syllogism, and if the conclusion follow from every one of his premises, or from any one of them, I will then humbly beg your pardon and his too : Indeed some of his Testimonies are such, as I much doubt, whether he brought them in jest, or in earnest. *Peter Martyr* and *Bogerman* are made to approve the *English* Hierarchy, pag. 252, 268. Because the one did write, the other speak to *English* Bishops by those names and titles by which they are commonly notified here in *England*. But is not this to affront us, as if we were quite void of Learning ? may we not as well argue from Mr. *Prynns* un-Bishoping of *Timothy* and *Titus*, that he also approved

ved the *English* Hierarchy, because he dedicates a Book with that name to the two Arch-Bishops by the Titles of Right Reverend Fathers in God, Primates and Metropolitans of all *England*: Is not this to lay a stumbling block in the way of the blind Quakers, and to make that silly Generation yet more averse from giving men those names, by which they are dignified in the places where they live? To suggest that a man cannot call one by the name commonly given him, but he must be interpreted to approve his office, and the way of coming to his office, and the claim he makes to his office? But it is also said of *Peter Martyr*, that he submitted to the Bishops whilst he was in *England*, pag. 252. Did he so? In what I wonder? Had they any power over the Kings Professor? Could they either visit him or silence him? And what if he had submitted to them? must he needs submit to them as to an order of men superior by Divine Law? to that Order of which he himself was? *Cranmer* most familiar with *Martyr*, never claim'd to be of such an Order, as his Manuscript kept by Dr. *Stillingsfleet* will witness; much less did he desire *Martyr*, or *Bucer*, or *Fagius*, to be reordain'd by him, that they might be capable of Ecclesiastical preferments; so as submission then was quite another thing to what it is now. Yet even the
Non-

Non-Conformists of that age thought they had wherewith to justify their Non-Conformity, and to speak as softly as is possible, they did as much credit the cause of the Protestants by suffering, as did any of the Conformists. And if I might make comparisons, none of them ever recanted for a time, as *Cranmer* did; none of them during the time of imprisonment went to Mass as *Ridley* had begun to do, and probably had continued so to do, had he not been recalled from that abomination, by the Letter of his Nonconforming Friend Mr. *Bradford*. And the exemplary courage and constancy of our Protomartyr, *John Rogers*, a very rigid Nonconformist, did greatly animate Bishop *Ridley*, as he himself acknowledges, I please not myself in these comparisons, should not have made them, had not Mr. *Durell's* pen dropt somewhat a foul blot upon the name of Bishop *Hooper's* friend *Peter Martyr*, whom he will needs represent to be so simple, as to scruple the Cap, because of its Mathematicalness: But he was too wise, to scruple the Cap on any such account; And hath better deserved of the *English* Church, than that he should so many years after his death be so flouted at, as also Bishop *Hooper* should have had more reverence shew'd him, than to be charged as he is pag. 239. with a *strange weakness*,
for

for sticking at our Ceremonies.

Let us now see how well Mr. *Durell* hath acquitted himself about forms of Prayer : It must be acknowledg'd he hath sufficiently prov'd from the Testimonies of Reformed Divines, that forms of Prayer of humane composition are not unlawful ; but the same thing had been long ago proved to his hand by a Nonconformist Minister, Mr. *John Ball* in his Discourse against Separation, as also by Dr. *John Hoornbek* in his Epistle touching Independency: so that I cannot wel tel what it was that made Mr. *Durell* so copious on this subject, unless he thought it wisdom to drive that nail which would go. I do assure him, I never yet met with a Presbyterian that thought forms of Prayer unlawful, or that thought it simply unlawful for a Church to agree upon forms of Prayer to be used by Ministers in the Publick Congregation. But if he can either prove that it is lawful for the Church to allow her Ministers no Liberty to use their own gifts for Prayer in the Publick, or prove that our *English* Church hath left her Ministers any such Liberty, then shall he do Knight-service.

In the first undertaking, he will have the Presbyterians his adversaries ; In the second, he will have Dr. *Heylin*, and many others as Canonical as himself to cope with. I have
heard

heard a Presbyterian disputing against sundry Passages in the Common-Prayer Book, and wondring why the Convocation should tye all Colledges and Halls to make use thereof, without any omission or alteration, when as there is not in the whole Book any one Petition for the Universities, and I was heartily troubled that I had not wherewith to remove my Friends admiration: But had I ever heard him say that a Form of Prayer was a breach of the second Commandment, I should have pittied his Ignorance, as I unfeignedly do the Ignorance of all those who account it any glory to a Reformation to leave in it no helps for some Ministers Infirmities. In this number cannot be placed either the Assembly of Divines, or the two Houses of Parliament that convened them. They both intended the Directory that Ministers might, if need were, have some help and furniture in their Administrations; and truly it was so sufficient an help and furniture, that he who needed other, could scarce be thought worthy to be a servant of our Lord Jesus Christ in the work of the Ministry. Here I must be pardon'd, if I reprove the presumption of Mr. *Durcell*, who trembles not pag. 3. to lay to the charge of Lords and Commons, and Assembly of Divines, *the delivering of manifest untruths*: The untruths are there said to be,

First, That the Common Prayer Book had prov'd an offence to the Reformed Churches abroad.

Secondly, That it was abolish'd to answer the expectations of other Reformed Churches.

I say those are no untruths; The Common-Prayer Book had proved an offence to the Reformed Churches abroad. *Apollonius* hath signified so much in reference to the *Walachrian* Churches, and others as famous as *Apollonius* have given us to understand as much in relation to the Churches of which they were Ministers; as the Latine Apologist hath too plainly proved: and can any one imagine that some Ceremonies prescribed in the Liturgy, were not an offence to *Martyr* and *Zanchy*? Perhaps those learned men did not count them simply unlawful, but certainly they were offended with them, and wisht them remov'd: Was it no offence to any Reformed Churches, that so many Legends out of the *Apocrypha* were appointed to be read in our Temples? No offence to Reformed Churches, that Infants Baptized were affirmed to be undoubtedly saved? Less colour is there to say there was a manifest untruth in asserting that the Common-Prayer Book was taken away to answer the expectation of other Reformed Churches; For it is notorious that the Churches of *Scotland* and *New-England*,
did

did expect from the Parliament the abolition of the Liturgy; and certainly, they might with propriety enough be called other Reformed Churches, if none besides them had expected the said abolition, as we can prove some others did: I must also crave leave to censure the Manifesto of Mr. *Derell*, published with a *Noverint universi*. Let all the world know that there never was, nor is yet any Reformed Church, that hath onely a Directory and not a Book of Common-Prayer for the publick worship of God. I ask, were there no Reformed Churches in the times of the Apostles, or men Apostolical? I trow there were, Yet it is certain, saith *Capellus*, that then there was no Prescript Form of Liturgy; nor doth that Author give us any notice of any Prescript Liturgies, untill Leaders and Doctors grew idle: were there when his Manifesto was published no Reformed Churches in *New-England*? or had these Churches Books of Common-Prayer? and why I strange are Directory and Book of Common-Prayer made opposit? were there not in some Reformed Churches Books of Common-Prayer, that were appointed to be used but as Directories, it being left free to the Ministers, either to use those Printed Prayers, or any other agreeable to them; this freedome I am sure sundry eminent and worthy Divines in *Holland* have all

along used: Mr. *Durell* indeed saith, that there is not one Minister in all *France* but hath made unto himself a set Form which he useth alwaies, and no other; pag. 18. which is certainly a bold assertion and supposeth him to have had conference with every Minister in *France*, or to have received Letters from every one, or at least to have employ'd Agents that had made enquiry concerning every one; which if true, would argue him a man of wonderful intelligence: Did never any one Minister in all *France*, make unto himself above one set Form of Prayer. Did, and doth every one of them precisely keep himself to those very words which he put together when he first entred into his Ministry? Did never any one after God had restored him to his Congregation from some eminent sickness, put in any one word to express his sense of Divine Goodness? I will here suspend my belief till I have received some farther Information, or can better tell in what sense Mr. *Durell* would have his words taken; for it may be he would have his own Phrases expounded as he himself, pag. 17. expounds some Phrases in one of the *French Rubricks* upon Sundays in the morning, the following Form is commonly used; The meaning whereof he tells us there, is, That it is to be alway used, and no other: A gloss that
sounds

sounds marvellous strange to our *English* ears, which have been accustomed to distinguish betwixt Commonly and Always; and will not easily unlearn that distinction: and so when we hear out of the Harmony of the *Belgick* Synods a Minister shall pray either by a certain Form proposed to himself, or else the Spirit shall dictate; we are wont to imagine that the meaning is not that a Minister shall never pray but by a Form; it may be Mr. *Durell* is of another mind: if he be, he may do well to communicate to the world the grounds of so singular an opinion, and when he shall so do he may do well also to give us his thoughts concerning the practice of the *Bohemian* Churches, where it seems the Ritual Books or Formula's are delivered ouely to the Pastors, the Reason whereof *Comenius* in his Annot. pag. 101. saith is, *That the Auditors might be more attent, and more profoundly admire the grace of God, for (says he) if ouely prescribed things are alwaies recited, what is there that may stir up attention, Curiosity rather will be stirred up whilst this and the other man attends, whether the Minister reads exactly the same things which they behold in their own books; nor (addeth he) must we think that the Ministers are tyed to the very words and syllables of the books delivered to them; it is free according to variety of occasions to use any thing*

draws

drawn out of the Treasures of mystical wisdom which makes for the exciting of zeal, whence it comes to pass that pious Auditors are scarcely ever present at holy Mysteries without a new motion of heart.

My imagination on the reading of these words is, that *Comenius* was not hugely fond of prescribed Formula's in which the people were as well versed as the Minister : he seems rather to be of opinion, that if words flow from the mouth of the Minister which the People had not seen before hand, they will be heard with the more Devotion : whether Mr. *Durell's* imaginations agree with mine, time may discover ; mean while I may have leave to guess what it was that moved Mr. *Durell's* pen to run into such excess of riot against the two Houses and Assembly, and I conceive it was the extravagance of his Country-man *Ludovicus Capellus* in his discourse about Liturgies, unhappily inserted into the *Theses Dalmurienses* ; for his words Mr. *Durell* has punctually transcribed and done into English, a Scholler may find them in the third part of those *Theses*, p. 707.

*Salmon
rict/M.*

I shall follow Mr. *Durell's* own Translation pag. 15.

One hundred forty years ago when the separation was made from the Church of Rome, and that the Christian people coming out of Babylon,
did

did cast off the Popes Tyranny, the sacred Liturgy was purged of all that Popish Superstition and Idolatry, and all such things as were overburdensom, or which did contribute but little or nothing to the edification of the Church. And so were framed and prescribed in several places, divers set forms of holy Liturgies, by the several Authors of the Reformation that then was; and those simple and pure in Germany, France, England, Scotland, the Netherlands, &c. differing as little as possible from the antient set Forms of the Primitive Church; which set Forms the Reformed have used hitherto, with happiness and profit, each of them in their several Nations and districts; till at last of very late, there did arise in England a froward scrupulous and over nice (that I say not altogether superstitious) Generation of men, unto whom it hath seemed good for many Reasons, but those very light and almost of no moment at all, not only to blame, but to cashier and abolish wholly the Liturgy used hitherto in their Church, together with the whole Hierarchical Government of their Bishops; instead of which Liturgy they have brought in their Directory as they call it.

On the words thus translated I adventure to say.

First, That I am not much in love with the Professors Chronology; He gratifies the Papists too much to say, or but to intimate that

that no secession was made from their Church till an hundred and forty Years before he put forth those *Theses*, some Churches had gone out of *Babylon* much sooner, some not so soon.

Secondly, I am less in love with his jumbling together of the Liturgies of *Germany, France, England, Scotland, Belgia*, for if the *Germans* did purge their Liturgie of every thing that was over-burdenfom and troublesome, or which did contribute but little or nothing to the edification of the Church, let a reason be given me why we leave any thing out of our Liturgies which they retain? did this Professor of Divinity think that nothing is retained in the *Lutheran* Liturgies that is burdenfom and operofous or that makes little to edification, or did he conceit that none of the *Lutheran* Churches are *German*? do the *Lutherans* Latine Songs contribute much to edification? are their Images apt to teach the foul? did ever any one get much good by having the bread put into his mouth instead of having it broken and delivered into his hand? what is I wonder the advantage of Exorcism? certainly if the *Lutheran* Liturgies recede as little as may be from the Forms of the Primitive Church, other Churches have receded very much from them.

Third-

Thirdly, It was a great misadventure to affirm that the Reformed had with profit and happiness each of them in their several Nations and Districts, used set Forms till lately the Liturgy was Cashired in *England*.

Had not *Calderwood* told the world long since, that for many years he had not used set Forms whilst he was Minister in *Scotland*? was not the Liturgy laid aside in *Scotland* before in *England*.

Fourthly, It is a sign of no great humility, for one Professor so severely to censure the actings of a whole Assembly of Divines, in which were many Superiour to himself in Learning; but let not Episcopal Divines much glory to find the Assemblies Reasons vilified, they will find the Reason of Mr. *Hooker*, their Oracle, as much vilified in this Censor's *Thesis de Festis*.

Fifthly, It is very Probable the good Professor had never read the Directory, *else he would not have left it on Record, that the Directory contains onely the Arguments of things to be said and done in the Administration of the Sacraments*; for in the Directory, the words for Administration of Baptism are prescribed, so are the words for the Administration of the Lords Supper.

Mr. *Durell* therefore by translating *Capellus* into *English*, hath but uncovered his naked-

ness, exposing him to contempt, who was before become too contemptible, by decrying the Hebrew points and Scripture Chronology, so opening a door to down-right infidelity: Yet as if he had not done him spight enough, He not only gives us his Text, but also draws six Observations from it, pag. 15, 16. in five of which he most grossly abuses him. The first is, *That all Reformed Churches have Liturgies*: This I say follows not from any words of *Capellus*, if *Mr. Durell* say it doth, his Logick is his own, let him make use of it. The second is, *That the Liturgy of the Church of England is judged by this great man to be not onely pure and free from all Popish Superstition and Idolatry, but also from all such things as were onerous and troublesome, or which did contribute but little to the Edification of the Church, as well as other Reformed Churches*. Twenty Cart-ropes will not pull this observation out of *Capellus* his words. He onely speaks of the Liturgy made by the first Reformers of our Church, which vastly differs from the present Liturgy that *Mr. Durell* takes upon him to defend. The third Observation is of all most marvellous, thus worded; *If these Liturgies ought to recede as little as possible from that of the Primitive Church as he doth intimate, undoubtedly the Liturgy of the Church of England is the best and most perfect of them all.*

If

If Mr. *Durell* will have this observed, we will observe it as the issue of an over-confident fancy, yet humbly praying that he would allow us to think that this observation hath no relation in the world to any words of *Capellus*; If he may be judge, our Liturgy differs more from the Primitive Liturgies, then the Liturgy of any Reformed Churches; for he sayes, *Primitive Liturgies were most brief and most simple, consisting of a few prayers, &c.* Now if we should grant our Liturgy to be very simple, certainly it is not very brief, nor does it consist of but a few Prayers: let Mr. *Durell* officiate according to it Morning and Evening, which I never knew any Conformist to do, and I will be bold to say, his Sermons afterwards shall not be over tedious: The fourth Observation is, *That of all who call themselves Reformed, the Presbyterians are the first that ever left off the use of set Forms of Prayer.* *Capellus* hath not the word Presbyterians in his work; nor am I certain whom Mr. *Durell* understands by them; perhaps he means the *English* Presbyterians, but how came they to be Presbyterians *ant' 1534*? *Capellus* was too wise a man to say, that they were the first that left off set Forms of Prayer; he knew well enough unless he onely was a stranger in *Israel*, that many years before the Assembly met at *Westminster* set Forms of

D 2

Prayer

Prayer had been laid aside and condemned as unlawful; by huge multitudes who were angry with the old meer Nonconformist because he would not seperate from the *English Church*, as well as endeavour a Reformation of some things. The fifth Observation is, *That the many reasons for which the Presbyterians had rejected the Common-Prayer Book, are very light, and almost of no moment at all:* 'Tis true that *Capellus* hath written something to this purpose, but it is the same *Capellus* who hath written so many bug-bear words against our *English Bishops*, in his *Theses de discrimine Episcopi & Presbyteri, & de vario Ecclesie regimine*, the former *Theses* he concludes thus, *That there was no cause why the Bishops and their Patrons should so greatly insult, and onely not grow insolent against those whom invidiously they called Puritans and Presbyterians.*

And let it be observed; that if the Presbyterians had onely reprov'd, and not cashier'd the Common-Prayer Book, their Reasons might have been sufficient, notwithstanding any thing *Capellus* saith to the contrary. Sixthly, Mr. *Durell* would have it observed, *That the Presbyterians themselves who are the known Authors of the Directory, are in Capellus his Judgment a froward, peevish and superstitious Generation of men. Capellus* does indeed call the Composers of the Directory morose and

fro.

froward, but seems unwilling to call them superstitious; and the same *Capellus* had commended them for shaking off the Yoke of Episcopacy in his *Theses de Vario Ecclesie regimine* Sect. 24. Let Mr. *Durell* when he puts out next, *English* these words, for they seem framed according to the Heart of the Presbyterians, and let him then also tell us, why he calls the Presbyterians *the known Authors of the Directory*. That Assembly that presented the Directory to the two Houses, was as to most of its Members, when first called, Hierarchical, and under an Oath of Canonical obedience; there are not very many of them living at present; of them diverse conform, and are as deeply engaged to use Liturgical worship as Mr. *Durell* himself; let him therefore when he has opportunity, enquire of them, whether they consented to have the Liturgy cashiered? and how they came to fall in love with it again? and what made them so fearful lest the old subscription should choak us, when as they themselves can swallow these new ones that are far bigger and more bulky?

By this time I hope it is come to my turn to make some observations upon the *Theses* of *Capellus*, and my Observations may be the fewer because I have already suggested so many, and the first thing I observe is,
That

That the men against whom *Capellus* was so hot, could not be the *English* Presbyterians, unless they were falsely represented to him : for these are his words, pag. 710, 711. *They with whom we have to do, bewray a manifest enough hatred against Formula's of Symbols or Confessions of Faith, and of Catechism, and the both antient and recent use and custome of them received in the Christian Church.* If these are the men he had to deal with, then had he nothing to do with the *English* Presbyterians, no men having more contended for Confessions of Faith and Catechisms in set words than they. Secondly, I observe that he represents himself and his fellow Professors as not condemning or inhibiting a free use of Prayers composed by Ministers themselves. Nay these are his words, pag. 713. *We plainly think it both lawful and consentaneous that they who can do it, should discover their gift and industry in praying, as in preaching, this onely we will, that the use of such prayers ought not to hinder the Liturgy constituted by publick Authority, and to take away and abrogate all use of it out of the Church.* And a little after he adds. *We deservedly condemn the rigour of those, who under pretext of a prescript Form of Liturgy, do study to eliminate out of the Church all use of Prayers conceived by Ministers themselves.* Let Mr. *Durrell* consider, whether this Damnatory sentence

tence do not fall upon many of his own Patrons and Abettours. Thirdly, I observe that when the Professor comes to contract what he had said, he determines concerning Formula's, as if *Smeckynnus* had too much influenced him, for he saith first, *That they are not absolutely in every time and place, and with all men necessary, because the Christian Church wanted them for some time: and it does not appear from sacred or exotick History, whether the Jewish Church did not want them before Christ, and Ezra, and from the time of Moses.* Secondly, *That they are not commonly necessary but for order and Decorum.* Thirdly, *Where and when there cannot be had learned Pastours who are able to teach the people by their Sermons and proper Prayers, that there Formula's are plainly necessary.* Fourthly, *Where there are learned and skilful Pastors; a publick Form of Liturgy is very profitable, and necessary to the Common Edification of the Church in the same Communion of Divine worship.* Fifthly, *That the use of such Forms cannot justly be condemned or disaproved, nor ought it, seeing it may be alwaies and every where profitable and most convenient, and has obtained in the whole Christian Church all the world over, for above 1300 years, and does every where now obtain, but with those Independant Novices.* Let Mr. Durell after this, take heed how he commends Liturgies, by the pen of his
most

most applauded foreign Divines : and let him know, that all the pains he takes, to make the *French* and *Dutch* Liturgies the same, or near a kin with and to ours, doth indeed tend to the reproach of Archbishop *Laud*. For if there were no difference, or but small betwixt them, why was he so zealous as his *Historian* represents him, in prosecuting and pressing the *French* and *Dutch* Churches, to have our Liturgy translated into their Language, and used by them in all their Churches granted them in *England*? however, let me warn Mr. *Durell* to take heed, that he do not go on with that designe he hath so oft acquainted us with, I mean the design of Printing together the Formula's and Agenda's of all the Reformed Churches in Christendome: for though this design might perhaps please himself (as who is not pleased with the issue of his own Brain) yet I much question whether it would be any way pleasing to the most Reverend and Right Reverend Prelates of our Church. Certain I am, that it is not many years, since some of our greatest Ecclesiasticks plainly enough declared, that such a designe would not much relish with them, for when the Prince Elector Palatine came over to visit his Uncle, King *Charles I.* in *England*, which was about 34 years ago, some busie heads (as Dr. *Heylin* calls them) published

a book intituled, *A Declaration of the Faith and Ceremonies of the Palsgraves Churches*. What was the effect of the Publication? a course was forthwith taken to call it in *for the same cause, and on the same prudential grounds* (adds Dr. Heylin) *on which the alteration* (I before mentioned) *was made in the Letters Patents*. But I needed not so long to have insisted upon Liturgies, having before told you what he must do that hopes to bring the Nonconformist to subscription; he must prove that the Church of *England* hath left Ministers any power to make use of their gifts in prayer, for if that be not proved, they will shrewdly argue against the lawfulness of promises to bury their gift in a napkin, but whether this be proved or no, the Nonconformists that I speak with, will be but Nonconformists; not forsaking the publick Assemblies, but rejoycing to hear Christ Preached, though not without some bitter reflections upon themselves.

I come to Ceremonies, and the first of *(a) Our Church* them that occurs, is the Surplice, concern-*said now* ing which, my Nonconformists Friends say, *such things* That if they used it as enjoyned by the Litur-*not any of* gy, they must receive it; *(a)* *as a vestment apt* *their songs* *by some notable signification it hath, to stir up the* *who under* *dull mind*; Now that I might satisfie their *stand w* Scruple, I have gone to some Conformists and *they say*

E

er-

enquired of them, whether ever they experimented any such aptness in it to stir up their dull minds; they most of them wondred at my Question, telling me that by assenting and consenting, they meant no more but onely to promise, that they would not openly contradict any thing in the Liturgy; you may easily imagine what motion this reply stirred up in my dull mind; onely one answered, that though he would not boast of his own experiences, yet he doubted not but the holy Vestment had a fitness in it to stir up the dull mind; but I asking him further, whether it was apt to stir him up *as a man*, or *as an English man*? he gave me to understand that he was not willing to be pressed further. I comforted my self however in this, that Mr. Durell would tell me some stories, of some great liveliness put into men by the wearing of the white Garment, but he quite deceived me, onely giving me to understand, pag. 24, 25. *Of some of other Reformed Churches that to comply with the Lutherans, do sometimes wear Surplices.* This is but cold kindness, and that I may not be in debt to him for it, I give him to understand, *That no Lutherans in the Low Countries do wear Surplices*; and they forbear to wear them, not because the Magistrate would not give them leave to wear them, but because they want a will to wear them, which makes

makes me think that they have no high opinion concerning the usefulness of them; nor can I think that our own Ministers have any huge apprehensions of this exciting vertue of the Surplice, for whereas they are enjoined to wear it as oft as they officiate; I find few of them so to do, many of them never wear it, but when a Sacrament is to be Administred. Perhaps I shall be able to afford my Nonconformists more help and assistance against his Scruples about the Cross in Baptisme: His Scruples are founded upon this bottom; That the Cross is made a sign of the Childs Dedication to God, and also a sign of his perseverance in Grace, and such a sign they say is Sacramental, which kind of sign the Church has no Commission from God to institute; I have taken some pains that I might be able from the writings of Conformists to assaile this Objection. Mr. *Duffell* tells us, *Serm. pag. 29.* That the Cross is indeed a visible sign, but there is no invisible Grace answering to it; and so no Sacrament. I could not acquiesce in this, for I thought Dedication to God, and Perseverance were our former graces; and if they be Graces, I am sure they are invisible Graces; I have also sometimes wondred, seeing Baptisme it self was instituted as a Dedicating sign, and seeing *Confession or faith of Chr. 2. Continuance or perseverance in it.*

by it we engage our selves to perseverance, and God also engages to give unto Believers the Grace of Perseverance ; what might move our Church to institute the Cross as a new sign of any of these things ? especially seeing yet I never had the hap to meet with any who could from their experience averre unto me that the sign of the Cross with which they were signed at Baptisme, had added to them any degree of manfulness: nor by comparing several Baptized persons could I ever observe, that persons Crossed at Baptisme, were less inclined to be ashamed of Christ Crucified, than those that were Baptized, not being Crossed. Indeed this sign of the Cross hath Ministred more matter of Scruple to the Nonconformists, then any other Ceremony besides ; and therefore Mr. Durell should not have dealt slightly in this matter, which yet any one may observe that he does, for instead of giving us instances of Reformed Churches that use the Cross in Baptisme. He contents himself to give us a few instances of Reformed Churches, that use the Cross out of Baptisme ; the Church of Geneva, he saies, *Makes the Christian Religion in a picture, to lean upon the Cross*, page 21. and page 31. *Does not think the Christian Religion sufficiently represented without the figure*

figure of a Cross. And the French Churches agreed Anno 1609. That they would not debarre from the Sacrament, Such as should wear Crosses upon their Cloaks; in case the King would not allow them the maintenance for maimed souldiers untill they did wear such Crosses; He might also have added that the Erectors of the short lived Commonwealth among us, did appoint a Cross to be set upon that Money which they presumed to Coin, and also put the figure of a Cross into the Flags of those ships which they set forth against his Sacred Majesty; and had he so done, would not any one at last have asked him to what purpose is all this waste of Examples? never did sober Presbyterian or Independant question such kind of Crosses, many of them perhaps will be found to have them in their Coat of Arms, and in their Signets with which they use to Seal their Letters; and yet would at no hand be induced to suffer their Children to be Baptized with the sign of the Cross, as a *signe of their Dedication to God*, or as a *token that afterwards they should not be ashamed of Christ Crucified*, &c. Mr. Durell had sure forgot that the Cross our Church appoints is a Transient Cross (by which Bishop Sanderson would have it distinguished sufficiently from the Cross of the Papists which

which is permanent) else he would not have brought so many instances of permanent Crosses which being the Objects of sight, may occasion in us some good thoughts and meditations concerning the Cross on which our Lord Jesus did suffer, but the Transient Cross leaving no visible impression on us, has no such aptness objectively to stir in us any good thought concerning Christ Crucified, and it is hard to conceive how it should be useful in the way of admonition, unless we had some one to admonish us that we were Crossed with such a Cross: I know that dipping, or sprinkling the Water, upon the body, leaves no visible impression upon it neither, but the spirit who alwaies abides in believers, hath an office to bring baptism to their remembrance, and hath so effectually brought it to remembrance that they have from considerations drawn from it, quenched the fiery darts of Satan, that this blessed Spirit will concern himself to bring our being Crossed in Baptisme to remembrance Mr. Durell will not hastily affirm: what then? would Presbyterians better approve of the making of a permanent Cross on the forehead of newly Baptised Infants? surely no. But they sometimes argue thus, *ad hominem*, and think that their is strength in their

the
th
be
ed
his
Ch
tion
Ch
ed
Cro
the
ed.
the
as
sign
ed
Cro
eno
for
ly
ther
that
ing
be
the
I
ly
abro
Div
this

their arguings. Mr. Durell hath no where that I can find, shewed their strength to be but weakness; rather he hath strengthened their hands by some expressions used in his Sermon, pag. 23. *Where he placeth Chrism used in Confirmation amongst superstitious or superfluous Ceremonies*: Now why the Chrism in Confirmation should be accounted superstitious or superfluous, and the Cross in Baptisme not be so accounted, there can no good reason at all be assigned. Is the Cross antient, so is Chrisme; the Cross as much abused by the Papists, as ever was the Chrism: the Cross made significant of what Baptisme it self signified; and signified more clearly than the Cross can signifie: and therefore superfluous enough, if that be superfluous which is used for the doing of that which was sufficiently done before; whereas in Confirmation there is no outward visible sign to signifie that which Chrism signifies; viz. Anointing with the Holy Ghost inwardly, as may be collected from a Petition yet retained in the Liturgy for Confirmation.

I am not now at leisure to enquire strictly into the usuages of Reformed Churches abroad, nor into the Sentiments of their Divines concerning our Ceremonies; but this I have found, that those who have
gone

gone from our Universities and travelled into forreign Reformed Churches, and Kingdomes, have generally returned to us again with very little fondness for our Ceremonies; now it seems very strange, that if the same Ceremonies be used abroad, that are used here; or if they abroad count them as indifferent as we do them at home, that Travells should ingenerate in any a dislike of them: and it is strange also if Mr. *Beza* had no worse thoughts of our Discipline and Rights, then Mr. *Durell* would make shew of; that he should have so good thoughts of Mr. *Travers*, and several other chief Nonconformists in *England*, as to make them his greatest Correspondents; for so I can prove he did by Letters still extant.

Hitherto I have shewed you, how much Mr. *Durell* hath mistaken, and mis-represented the state of those Controversies that are on foot among us; I will now give you in a short Catalogue of Impertinences, by which you shall see that he hath stuffed his Book with Testimonies, to prove that which never any Presbyterian denied, or ever gave him the least occasion to think he denied; The first place in this Catalogue is due to his Testimonies mustered up, pag. 51, 52. relating to Sa-

cri-
pu-
for
wi-
ift
the
tha
the
fes
nor
wi-
dur
the
an-
to
un-
cep
hav
Ch
us
an-
wor
La
fel
mor
tat
Sa
con
nor
tio

cri-

criledge, a Species whereof he saies is the
 purchasing and detaining of Church Lands : I
 for my part think so too, and never yet met
 with a Presbyterian that thought otherwise :
 if there be a true superfluity of Church Lands,
 then the Magistrate doubtless may out of
 that superfluity take for any other good use,
 though it be not directly Ecclesiastical. In ca-
 ses also of great necessity Church Lands seem
 not to be priviledged from sale ; nor can any
 wise man doubt but that it is the Magistrates
 duty to convert such Lands as were given to
 the Church by a Zeale without knowledge,
 and to promote Idolatry and Superstition, un-
 to such uses as are truly pious and acceptable
 unto God. These, and other such like Cases ex-
 cepted, the Presbyterians would as willingly
 have a *Noli me tangere* upon every parcel of the
 Church Lands as Mr. Durell himself. He tells
 us indeed, page 51. *That many here among us
 and some of them Presbyterian Ministers made
 nothing of purchasing and detaining Church
 Lands; and another, as very a Scribler as him-
 self, hath told us, That in the Annotations com-
 monly known by the name of the Assemblies An-
 notations he could never meet with any thing against
 Sacriledge in any of those places where he had
 consulted them ; the first edition of those An-
 notations I have not by me, but if that Edi-
 tion had nothing in it against Sacriledge, let*
 F the

the Saddle be set upon the right Horse, and the blame laid upon Dr. *Daniel Feately*, who Commenting upon *Romans* the 2d. where the word *Sacriledge* occurs, would let it pass uncensured; but I have heard that in our latter Editions of the *English Annotations* Dr. *Feateleys* Notes are not altered; if so, the Debator hath reason to be ashamed of his impudence, and railing accusation, for any one may see that *Sacriledge* is sufficiently condemned at *Rom. 2. 22.* and it is severely Censured *Acts 5.* as also *Prov. 20. 25.* and if that be not also censured *Ezekiel 48.* who must bear the blame, but *Bishop Richardson* to whose share it fell to Comment on that portion of Scripture: Certainly the second and third Editions of the *English Annotations* were Printed in times in which it was all out as dangerous to reprove *Sacriledge*, as in those times in which the first Edition was put forth. In those Editions I have already referred to enough that makes against *Sacriledge*, yet if need were, I could refer to much more, and possibly should so do, were it not that the work had been long since done to my hand by an Episcopal Divine, in a Discourse Printed 1648. with this Title, *Church Lands not to be sold.* He that will be at pains to peruse that book, shall soon find that no one could keep the Covenant and not be a gainst

gain
27.
an h
and
or c
stain
disc
Aff
the l
sam
they
put
fom
pur
wer
this
nev
his
teri
pro
nist
fwa
Mi
def
An
too
an
it
an
for

X
nor ha
nor any
B. P. was
any An
no futo
in 5. A
samely
Notes

gainst the alienating of Church Lands, page 27. he quotes these words from Mr. Gearee an holy Nonconformist: *To abolish Prelacy, and to seize the Lands of Prelates to private, or civil Interest, undoubtedly could neither want stain nor guilt*; adding, *I am confident, by the discourse I have had with the most able of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, that at the least three parts, if not all of them are of the same Judgment with Mr. Gearee, and that they would openly profess as much if they were put to answer the Question.* But saith Mr. Durell, some of the many who made nothing of purchasing and detaining Church Lands, were *Presbyterian Ministers*, and to prove this, in the Margent he puts Dr. Burges's never so much as adding an &c. so that in his Arithmetick Dr. Burges's is some Presbyterian Ministers. But he should first have proved that he was one Presbyterian Minister before he had gone about to persuade us that he was sundry Presbyterian Ministers. He is not that Dr. Burges's who defended the three Ceremonies against Dr. Ames, but yet he is the Dr. Burges's that took care to have that Defence Printed, and beautified the Margent of it to make it he more pleasing to the Readers eye; and he is the Dr. Burges's that did write for Baptifinal Regeneration, which the

Presbyterian can by no means swallow. I have heard indeed that he took the Covenant, but not till he saw that it was dangerous not to take it. I have heard also that he was employed to make a Speech in answer to Dr. *John Hackett*, who was to plead for the continuance of Deanes and Chapters, but in that Speech he openly declared *the utter unlawfulness of converting Dean and Chapters Lands to any private persons profit*: so that he then delivered the same Doctrine with Dr. *Hackett*, only differing in the Application, as Mr. *Fuller* words it, book II. page 179. It seems afterwards he himself was a Purchaser, and a great Purchaser contrary to the Doctrine delivered by him, for which I leave him to his own Master, unto whom he hath some years since given his Accounts. Mr. *Durell* as if he were a Privy-Councillor in Heaven, presumes in his Latin book to say, *That the Cancer of which he dyed, beset him for his Sacrilege*; I dare not so say, the Providences of God are too great a deep for any man to venture himself into, and methinks Mr. *Durell* might have been deterred from such presumption, by the example of Gods dealing with Bishop *Gawden*, who after that he had written for the Liturgy, and against Sacrilege, dyed not long

long after of a Disease as loathsome, and far more painful than that which brought Dr. *Burgess* to his Grave, and this Disease was that very Disease unto which he had compared the Presbyterian Sermons, and befell him in a very short time after he had made the Comparison; yet all these Circumstances notwithstanding no man shall ever hear me say *That the sickness was a stroke of Divine Justice inflicted on him for his fierceness against the Presbyterians.* Indeed the Providence of God is to us so hidden and secret, that there is no concluding from it either love or hatred: and therefore the Sons of the Church have no reason to thank Mr. *Durell* for saying, page 17. of his Sermon, *That the wonderful manner of raising our Church up again is an evident proof that she is her Beloved's, and her Beloved hers, and an Argument that her Reformation (since neither mens Craft nor violence which so far prevailed against it were never able to destroy it) is certainly the work of God and his Counsel which shall stand. Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis.* Our Church needs no such Tophicks, she will think that he has a minde to betray her, who useth them on her behalf, for who knows how soon God provoked by our sins, may turn the stream of his Providences, and bring
our

our Church Governours under as great poverty and reproach as ever: If the stream of Providence should never turn, yet all Theological ears will abhor to hear our *English Reformation* called *the Counsell of the Lord which shall stand*. That is a Scripture Phrase and Printed as such by Mr. *Durell*, and therefore ought not to have been so palpably wrested by him: Dare any man think that the Decrees and Counsels of God are changed, unless our Reformation as attended with all its Rites, and Cermonies, endure from generation to generation? But I have almost run away from the business of Sacriledge. If any man desire to know how zealous Reformed Divines have been against this sin, he may quickly inform himself from Dr. *Hornebeckes Examen bullæ Papalis*. I only adde, that some men have been so hardy, as to say that our Impropriations are a kind of Sacrilege. The Lord Bacon seems to be of that mind, and charges all the Parliaments since the 31. of *Henry VIII.* with debarring Christs Wife of a great part of her dowry: if so, Mr. *Durell* may find more Sacriledge among his friends then he is aware of, and he may do well to enquire whether the impropriations of the several Cathedrals, to which he himself belongs

long
cum
cien
ther
ted
Lett
joyc
am
ed l
worl
Title
Dure
be fr
able
ners,
first,
A
is his
Chur
of Pr
Peopl
Praye
their
it we
else b
Th
Waste
in mo
Harm
in th

longs, are so disposed of, as that the Incumbants residing upon them have a sufficient and honerable maintenance allowed them. His Majesty hath graciously emitted a Letter, that it might be so; if the Letter have been universally obeyed, I rejoyce in the obedience given to it, but I am sure heretofore no Impropiators allowed less then Clergy-men; no parishes were worse supplied, than those in which the Titles went to the Cathedralls, unless Mr. Durell be sure that he and his Fraternities be free from this sin, it will not be seasonable for him to throw stones at other sinners, least it should be said, *thou Hypocrite, first, &c.*

A Second of Mr. Durell's Impertinencies, is his Quotation, pag. 40. of the *Bohemian Churches, for the peoples saying Amen at the end of Prayers.* Did the Presbyterians ever say, the People might not say Amen at the end of Prayers? are they not rather judged by their Adversaries, to erre by affirming, that it were meet for the people to say nothing else but *Amen*?

Thirdly, What made him, pag. 43. *Waste paper to prove that Confirmation is used in most Reformed Churches?* Did not Mr. Hammer, and Mr. Baxter, write whole books in the commendation of Confirmation? Did

Did the Presbyterians ever more heartily desire any thing, than that adult persons might before they were admitted to the Lords Supper, he ordered to make a Confession of Faith, and to declare their Resolution to own that Faith, and to walk according to it? Did they not atway with grief of heart complain that Confirmation had never been practised here in *England*, or else had been turned into a meer form?

Fourthly, Wherefore are we told page 37, 38. *That the Lords Prayer and Ten Commandments and Creeds, are sung in some Reformed Churches; as also the Magnificat, the Benedictus, and the Nunc dimittis.* Do the Presbyterians question the lawfulness of singing any of these? or do they require any more than that they should be put into Meeter, and set into such tunes as ordinary people might follow? I myself have heard an eminent Presbyterian Divine on a day of Humiliation, read and sing the Lords Prayer, as it is Translated and Printed at the end of our Psalm books. Yea, where as Mr. Durell tells us *That the French Church does not sing the Lords Prayer, and the Creed of the Apostles, because both the Rhyme and Language were something coarse and old* Presbyterians never left off to sing according

ding to the Vulgar Translation, its oldness and coarseness notwithstanding, and if hymns should be made out of other places of Scripture by men wise and skilful, who is there that would blame them?

Fifthly, Who ever quarrelled with the French Churches, *for having great silver Chalicees for the Communion*, as he tells us they have, pag. 32.

Or who would be offended if richer Churches had the ten Commandments in Letters of Gold, and the Creed, and the Lords Prayer in the same form. I have heard one of the chief Presbyterian Ministers did rejoice, that the Lords Prayer was by the Painter drawn in very visible Characters upon a wall, just over against his Pulpit, for by that means, if at any time he happened to be as much out in repeating of that form; as Mr. *Durell* lately was in the repeating of the Belief, he might help himself, and not put himself and others to shame, as Mr. *Durell* did.

Sixthly, He tells us pag. 32. *That in all Reformed Churches men used to enter into the place of publick worship with their hats off*, which is as great an untruth, as ever dropped from writers pen, unless it be understood of places of publick worship, whilst publick worship is actually performed in

them, and if it may be so understood, then the Presbyterians would hugely approve of it. By the Directory it was enjoined that, all enter the Assembly not irreverently, but in a grave and seemly manner: gravity and seemliness do include putting off the hat, which yet would be a ridiculous action, if a man should use it, as too many now a days do as oft as they go through the Church, though none be met for worship, and though they themselves intended no worship: nor does the Directory any where condemn the manner which Mr. Durell tells us hath obtained among the French Ladies, viz. *to unmask themselves when they come into the Temple*; provided they do not unmask themselves out of a vain or wanton design; if they should do so, they know by whom they are condemned. [*I but saith Mr. Durell, the devoutest sort both of men and women, use to kneel and make a Prayer for Gods blessing, before they sit down, and this the Directory prohibits.*] Had he said that the devouter sort use a short Prayer when they took no seats, and came to perform no service to God; then he had said something to excuse the actings of some among us. The peoples making a secret Prayer before they sit down in their seats, is not forbidden by the Directory, unto all, or unto any,

any, but these who come into the Church the publick worship being begun, and whether it be more meet for such to betake themselves to their private devotions, or to join with the Assembly in that ordinance that is in hand, let the learned judge for they are wise.

Seventhly, All might have been spared that is brought, pag. 33. Of Peoples standing bare in time of Divine Service, and at the Administration of Sacraments: In the very Church of *Scotland* all are uncovered at the Administration of the Sacraments; here in *England* men had left off to put on their hats in time of Sermon (which Mr. *Durell* seems to distinguish from Service) had Mr. *Calamy* and others been hearkened to.

Eighthly, Above all, what need we be told, pag. 22. That *Calvin wore a Gown and a Cap*: Were not Presbyterians accustomed so to do in the Universities? Those sent down by the two Houses to *Cambridge*, did all of them preach in the University Church in their Gowns, and in their Hoods; and I never heard of any, but Brownists, that questioned the using of the very same Churches that the Papists had used; yet we have fine stories of that, pag. 28. As also of the Ring in Marriage, as if there were some

odde Nonconformists that did scruple being Married with a Ring. He tells us also of Matrimony in the publick Congregation, pag. 47. celebrated also by a Minister just according as the Directory orders; but if he would have gratified us here in *England*, he should have told us that all Reformed Churches do count Marriages valid, though made without and against the consent of Parents, as also that they have Officers, whom they allow to give Licenses for Marriages, though there have been no Banes published, nor any thing equivalent thereunto, but to affirm this had been somewhat too gross. Pag. 48, and 49. He minds us, *that in most Reformed Churches the dead are buried with great solemnity, singing of Psalms, and Funeral Sermons*; as if Presbyterians had scrupled the Preaching of Funeral Sermons, or had not been wont when desired to Preach them. I believe if Comparisons were made, Presbyterians formerly preached more Funeral Sermons, then Prelatical men do now, and that very many of those for whom Sermons are now Preached, are addicted to Presbytery. Mr. Durell should have called to remembrance, that our Church hath appointed no Funeral Sermons, nor required any more of her Ministers, save only to meet the Corps at the Church Stile.

and

and so go either into the Church, or towards the Grave, to say or sing some verses out of Holy Writ: I do not find that by the old Liturgy it was required that the Corps should be brought into the Church, though now I find one or two Psalms appointed to be read after the Minister and people are come into the Church, and by Comparing the old and new Liturgy together, I find where in the old was the word [Minister] in the new there is ^{Not so.} constant-^{set y. of} ly the word [Priest,] so that whereas a ^{office for} ~~Deacon~~ ^{visitation} may preach to us, and Baptize our ^{of sick} Children, he may not bury our dead, which ^{Not pr} seems to be a Mystery worthy Mr. Durells ^{con can} unridling. Our Clergy men themselves seem ^{Baptiz} Strangers to this mystery, for nothing is ^{str y Ru} more usual among them, than to set ^{6 in quor} Deacons to bury their dead; nor can I in that ^{for Bap} old Liturgy which I follow, find any notice ^{hi/mu.} given, that the office for the burial of the dead, is not to be used at the burial of such as die unbaptized, in the new Liturgy such notice is given; the reason whereof I am not so happy at present as to know: why should Infants that die unbaptized, through no fault of their Parents, be denied such a burial as Baptized Infants have? Mr. Durell is a knowing man, and can satisfy us about these matters, and brings us, no question,

stion, many Reformed Churches where the same usage obtains; but why did he bring in his Friend, Mr. Drelincourt, saying pag. 49. *That he should account the Custome of the Ministers of the Reformed Churches in France, being silent at dead mens burial, unsufferable, were it not for their present condition.*

That learned worthy Divine knows, that the Reformed Churches in *Holland*, are under no such condition as the French Churches, and yet their Ministers are perpetually silent at the burials of dead men; Is their Custome unsufferable? I believe he will not so pronounce, and therefore will scarce think himself civilly dealt with, to have a Fragment of a private Epistle thus published, especially seeing it reflects disgrace upon the Ministers of his own nation, who are Pastors in *Holland*; I have been too tedious in examining this impertinence. The Communion also he tells us, pag. 44. *Is constantly celebrated at certain set times in all Reformed Churches.* And is there any thing in the Directory against the celebrating of it at certain set times? Does it not say, that it is frequently to be celebrated? And take order that notice shall be given before hand of its celebration? nor does the Directory any where forbid the Administering of the Communion unto those that

are

are sick in private houses, though if it had so done, it might have justified it self by the Example of many of the best Reformed Churches. Let Mr. *Durell* when he is at leisure, enquire whether one of the Assembly of Divines did not Administer the Sacrament to Captain *Hotham* when he was just going to be Beheaded? or whether he was ever censured for so doing?

I will enlarge my Catalogue no farther; by the instances already produced, it appears, that Mr. *Durell* may well be called Mr. *Impertinent*. But I shall now by sundry instances make it evident also, that he hath thrust sundry things into his book, that are like enough, if they fall into the hands of a weak Reader, to be prejudicial and pernicious, and to alienate him from our Church. He tells us page 8. the *Hungarian* and *Transilvanian* Churches are as Pure and Reformed, as any whatsoever; but page 10, & 11. he spoils all, and takes a great deal of pains so to do, borrowing a book very rare and scarce; and out of it acquainting us, *That in those Churches Ministers wear obedience Canonical unto Presbyters as well as Bishops: and, That Ministers are to be governed by certain Laws by an eminent sort of Presbyters, called Elders, as well as by Bishops.* Then which, what can be more derogatory to the Episcopal

pal Power, Place, Jurisdiction, and Ordination in Presbyters as well as Bishops? and what Eminence will there then be left for Bishops? what will there be left to a Bishop, more than what the Presbyterians have a thousand times over acknowledged themselves ready to yield him? It may be he thought he should heal his wound by saying as he does, *page 8. That these Elders are indeed Bishops, and the Bishops Archbishops.* But I say they are indeed but a more Eminent sort of Presbyters; so they are expressly called, and they can be no other; because they were never by Ordination put into an Office, or Order superior to that of Presbyters; and observable it is (*vid. pag. prædict.*) *That the Minister acknowledgeth himself in his Oath, to receive the function of the sacred Ministry from the there present Ministers of God, and most Faithful dispensers of his Mysteries.* Which are Phrases agreeing unto all that are entrusted with the word of Reconciliation: So that this Testimony looks with a very evil eye upon Episcopacy: and so does much more the Testimony of the *Bohemian Churches*, related *pag. 11, 12, 13.* for in that we have Presbyters Ordaining *Bohemian* Bishops, a thing that sounds dreadful to an Episcopal ear. This story will strengthen the Presbyterians, and be a second unto that with which they

they are wont so much to confirme themselves; I mean the History of *Pelagius* Bishop of *Rome* being ordained by two Bishops and one Presbyter. These Histories do at least prove that Presbyters and Bishops were of the same Order, and that Presbyters as well as Bishops, may lay hands upon Bishops, and confer the power of making Ministers. Indeed the man makes himself ridiculous who goes about to look for any Bishop properly so called among the *Waldenses*; and he does gratifie the Presbyterians not a little, page 38. whilst he tells them, *That the French Churches sing at the end of the Commandments, these four verses which answer to our Lord have mercy upon us and incline, &c.* for this is the very thing that Presbyterians desire, that these words might be uttered at the end of the Commandments, and not at the end of every particular Commandment: pag. 45, 46. he takes Mr. *Calvins* pen and drops a very foul blot upon our Church; for the custome of Receiving thrice a year, which is known to be our custome, (for no man is bound to Receive oftner) is by him the called *vitiosus mos*, (i.e.) a vitious custome at least, if not a custome full of vice. But page 53. he calls us all, Fools by Craft; for these are his words, *That every National Church ought to have Uniformity within it self, hath alwayes been the*

judgment of all sober and wise Christians, and is at this day the good example of all the Reformed Churches in the world I assume, that there ought to be Uniformity in every National Church, hath not alwaies been, nor yet is the Judgment of the Church of *England*; what Conclusion hence arises every one seeth, but the Conclusion is so horrid that I will not form it. My Assumption I prove from the Canons of 1640. which are so far from determining that there ought to be an Uniformity, that they expressly allow a Difformity, desiring in reference to the Rite of doing Reverence and Obeysance towards the East at our coming in, or going out of the Church, that the Rule of Charity prescribed by the Apostle may be observed, (*i. e.*) *That they which use this Rite, despise not them who use it not; and that they who use it not, condemn not those that use it.* And how will the Presbyterians rejoyce to read those high commendations of the *Bohemian Churches*. 'Tis said page 64. *That they are the first that Reformed Religion from Popery to True and Primitive Christianity:* and page 99. 'tis said, *Happy had been all the Christian word, if, as the said Churches were the first that Reformed themselves from Popery, the way of their Reformation had been followed by all others who Reformed after them.* This his high Opinion he

confirms by the Testimony of Learned *Zanchy*, and might also have confirmed it by the Testimony of *Luther*. Well! this being supposed must not the Presbyterians carry the day? they think they must, and therefore one of them, not many years since, Translated *Comenius* into *English*, as making very much for that Plat-form they aimed at. Indeed in the Order of those Churches I find Lay-Presbyters, and which is more, Lay-Presbytresses, and Eleemosynaries answering to the Presbyterians Deacons. Officers I know they have called by the name of Antistites, which may be rendered Bishops; but every one of them to submit himself to the judgment not only of his Colleagues but also of the Conseniors, and to admit admonition, Counsels, and reproof from them, and these Conseniors are together with their Antistites to exercise Discipline upon Ministers. The Lords day those Churches keep as strictly as the Presbyterians contend to have them kept. Baptisme they administer without the sign of the Cross; with them none are thought to belong to the Pastoral Cure of Ministers, but those who do with good will submit themselves to that Unity and Order; whereas among us every one must be a Church Member or else go to the Common Goal; and that which answers un-

To Confirmation amongst them is performed
 only by the Minister ; and before every Sacra-
 ment, the Master of a Family and his House-
 hold come to the Minister and are by him
 examined ; some few Holy-dayes indeed
 are kept in these Churches, but so, that
 when Divine Service is ended, people go to
 their work as upon other dayes : There is
 no order among them to abstain from the
 works of their Calling on the Saints day, or
 to keep the Evening before, Fast, so that
 these Churches are as Presbyterian as
 Presbyterians themselves can desire ; what
 was it then that moved Mr. Durell so tran-
 scendently to extol them ? page 46. He tells
 us, That those Churches that first Reformed
 from Popery, receive the Communion kneel-
 ing, and it is true, they do so ; but they
 did not do so from the beginning. In the
 year 1494. they received the Communion
 standing, but were forced to leave off that
 gesture, because their Persecutors were the
 more bitter upon that account, and would
 not this be a goodly Argument think you ?
 the *Bohemian* Church to avoid persecution
 receives the Sacrament kneeling, therefore
 it is conformable with the *English* Church,
 that persecutes all who do not receive the
 Sacrament kneeling. I but, when these *Chur-*
ches did joyn with those of Major Polonia and
 Lithu-

Lithuania, it was unanimously forbidden to receive that blessed Sacrament sitting, because among other Reasons, that unmannerly and irreverent gesture was peculiar to those Miscreants the Arrians amongst them, and they made this observation, That the custome of sitting at the Lords Table was first brought into some of their Churches by those who most miserably falling from their Communion did renounce the Lord who redeemed them, wherefore they inwent and exhort all their Company and Bretheren, that they would change sitting, into standing or kneeling. For this Mr. Durell refers us to a general Synod celebrated 1583. But every one that looks into the Harmony of Confessions will see that Mr. Durell hath not dealt fairly; for first, He leaves out a Parenthesis of the Synod, in the which it is expressly said, *That that gesture of Session with others is free.* Secondly, Whereas the Synod saies that Session was brought in *potissimum malo Auspicio.* This Mr. Durell Translates *was first brought in.* I grant indeed that in another Synod, to which this Synod doth refer, celebrated 1578. it is expressly said, That they who fell off to Arrianisme were the first Authors of sitting in their Churches; but that Synods words Mr. Durell does not Translate, and therefore has Translated either ignorantly or dishonestly. Let it also be ob-

observed, that this Synod does pray and beseech people to leave off sitting, not command them under the pain of Excommunication; yea this Synod by allowing what was done in the former Synod, does determine, *That it is unlawful to smite Godly men with Ecclesiastical Discipline because of external Rites.* Let me also add, that the Fathers of this Synod were under a mistake when they said, *That no Church in Europe anno 1583. did use sitting at the Lords Table,* and Mr. Durell is much more mistaken if he thinks that any Socinians first brought up the custome of sitting amongst us here in *England*, for what if Dr. Owen said truly when he confuted the Socinians, *That Socinianisme had generally spread it self into the Nation;* yet sitting had been used before Socinianisme so spread it self, I never heard that there was a Socinian either in the Assembly, or in the two Houses untill that one Mr. Free got among the Commons, who for his Blasphemies was cashiered that House, as I have somewhere read.

Had Mr. Durell pleased, he might have consulted a Catechisme made by *Thomas Beacon* Prebend of *Canterbury*, and Printed *cum Privilegio 1563.* in which Catechisme, the Learned Divine and Godly Confessour saith; *That if sitting at the Lords Table,*
which

which
ches,
comm
ly us
gestur
Disc
ving.
ton,
infor
Que
daine
her
lishe
B
that
per
mian
into
for
suff
Eng
plea
sem
surv
he
and
202
of
or
Bif

which was then used in certain Reformed Churches, were received by publick Authority, and common Consent, and might be conveniently used in our Churches, he could allow that gesture best. And Mr. Robert Nicholls, in a Discourse of kneeling in the act of Receiving, long since presented to Bishop Morton, but not printed till 1660, would have informed him; That in the beginning of Queen Elizabeths Raigh, standing was Ordained at Coventry and Northampton, by her Majesties Commission, and kneeling abolished.

But there was another thing perhaps, that might move Mr. Durell to be so superlative in the commendation of the *Bohemian* Churches; namely, a Crotchet got into his head, of calling an Assembly of forreign Divines that should all give their suffrage for the Discipline and Rites of the *English* Church: which Crotchet did so please him, that he begins to call that Assembly, page 200 and *Comenius*, the only surviving Bishop of the *Bohemian* Churches, he will give the Honour to speak first; and accordingly doth bring him in, pag. 202, 203, 204, 205. with a long Harangue of words in the commendation of Unity or Order; but is so uncivil to the aged Bishop, as not to allow him liberty to speak

speak all he had to speak: I must there-
 fore, out of the Reverence I have for his
 gray haire, and the respect that all Chri-
 stian Churches bear to him for his Learn-
 ing and Piety, doe him so much right, as
 to let him speak farther about the Contro-
 versies agitated among us: he hath a Pa-
 rænesis to the Churches, and by name, the
English Church; in that page 146. he tells
 us what he would have taken from Epif-
 copacy: *Secular Dominion, Terrene Riches*
or Wealth, and the Pompe of Ceremonies:
 and in the next page, brings in the Papiests
 laughing and jearing at us for the Cere-
 monies that we retained here in *England*,
 since our Reformation; so that I may well
 conclude, that it had been more for the
 interest of the Church, to have passed o-
 ver the *Bohemian Churches* in silence; and
 it had been well also, if the *Consensus Po-*
lonia had never been mentioned; for in
 that we shall find a Synod at *Cracovia*,
anno 1573. disputing *de Choreis*, and when
 some had alledged that there were honest
 as well as dishonest dancings, it was at last
 concluded by the suffrage of all, as well
 Seculars as Clergy, that they were to be
 condemned according to the Scripture, and
 to be forbidden unto all that profess true
 Piety. Will it much please some of our Go-
 vernours

vernours that young Students are by Mr. Durell directed to read the Determinations of this Synod, but this is one of the least of the mischiefs that he doth us; pag. 93. being surpris'd with a pang of vain glory, and designing to acquaint us with his own Sufferings, he doth not stick to deliver that which involves the same greater part of his present Conforming Brethren under the guilt of Rebellion and Schisme, for these are his words, pag. 93. *It is known how great the Persecution was against all Ministers who adhered to the King and Church of England, during the late troubles, those who were more gently dealt with, were only plundered, turned out of their Livings, or imprisoned; there were others, whom it was thought fitter to cast out of the Land, &c.* Out of these words, supposing what is manifest, that they who adhered not to the King and to the Church, are Traytors and Schismaticks, thus I argue: All that adhered to King and Church suffered, either to Deprivation or Banishment, most of the present Conformists, neither suffered to Deprivation nor Banishment; therefore most of the present Conformists neither adhered to King nor Church, and by Consequence were Traytors and Schismaticks. The *Major* is Mr. Durell's own; The *Minor*

is known to all the Nation; most of the present Conformists either enjoyed their own Livings during the late troubles, or were put into new Livings. If Mr. *Durell* had enquired of him who Licensed his Book, he would have told him that he enjoyed a very good Fellowship in *All Souls*, during the late confusions, but it is usual with Mr. *Durell*, where he thinks any Presbyterian is within his reach, to lay about him, though he must needs strike through the love of most of his own Friends. So pag. 44 tell us, *That those who profess themselves to be Orthodox had either altogether neglected the Sacrament in most Parishes of these three Kingdomes, or else had ministered it only to some few choice persons.* Which is to throw dirt into the faces of his Episcopal Brethren, for they possessed most of the Parishes in this Kingdome to be sure, and as for the Kingdome of *Scotland*, there was no neglect of the Sacrament, untill that our *English* Armies had made it impossible for them to exercise their Discipline. But *Aquilla non capit muscas*, it is a small thing with Mr. *Durell* thus to scratch our *English* Clergy unless he also wound the whole *English* Nation, and that we find him doing; for after he had told us that he would let down out of Monsieur *Le Moyne's* Letter

ter as much as fitted his purpose, he sets down this, pag. 136. *The English have a Natural fierceness, and withall a natural inclination to Superstition*; Doth this Character of our Nation fit Mr. Durell's purpose? then certainly it is a wicked purpose, which cannot be managed but by the causeless aspersions of a whole Nation: Usually Superstition dwells in the timorous and dastardly Nature. We, unhappy Mortals that we be, are naturally fierce, and yet naturally Superstitious; he that had observed this concerning us, should have been so friendly as to tell us what kind of Superstition it is, that we are so naturally inclined to, that so we might have known how to have watched, and prepared Antidotes against it, if there be any Antidotes strong enough to expell that which is natural. The Author of this Letter whom Mr. Durell calls one of the ordinary Preachers to the Reformed Congregation of *Roan*, (which certainly is a Phrase of disparagement to *English* ears) thinks that upon account of our Natural fierceness and superstition, *We stand in need of a Government somewhat Despotically*, that is, of a Government by Bishops; but I would query what kind of Bishops we must have: Nature teacheth us to desire some of our

own Nation, and if they be of our own Nation, are not they Naturally Fierce and Superstitious too; if they be, what Despotical power shall we have to cure them; if they be not, then it seems the Episcopal Character expells the Natural Fierceness and Superstition that dwells in *English* Natures; but we never yet had any experience, that a mans being made a Bishop in *England* did work any cure of his Natural Fierceness and Superstition. Some men have thought that divers after they were advanced to Episcopal Dignity grew more fierce and more superstitious, but this I neither affirm nor deny. In the same Letter pag. 134. it is said, *That it cannot enter into a Rational Mans Imagination, that a great Kingdome should come by custome to be content to see its Bishops no more, having honoured and revered them for the space of one thousand four hundred years.* This is good news to the Bishops, and if they can believe it, they may in *utramque aurem indormire*, for Episcopacy it seems as well as Superstition is grafted into the Natures of the members of this great Kingdome, and they can neither suddenly, nor by custome be brought so much as to a contentedness to want their Hierarchy. The Author of this Epistle is famed to be a great Historian,

rian, and I doubt not but he is so, but methinks he is mistaken in his Chronology, whilst he makes this great Kingdome to have revered and honoured Bishops for one thousand four hundred years. I find not any good evidence that there were any Bishops among us, till *Augustine* the Monk was sent to us from *Rome*, and it is not one thousand four hundred years since *Augustine* came hither. I say there is no good evidence of Bishops till then, for Venerable *Bede* the onely Author to be regarded concerning matters Ecclesiastical, preceding *Augustine's* mission from the Pope, tells us indeed of *Brittish* Bishops, but after he hath said *Episcopi* he adds *sen Doctores* which renders it very uncertain, what kind of men he means by Bishops: And Mr. *Petoy* a late Historian hath adventured to say, *That our Church as well as the Scottish Church was at first planted and Governed without Bishops, till Bishops were sent to us from Rome.* But be this as it will, certain I am, our great Kingdome could not be said to honour and reverence Bishops, till by the Preaching of *Augustine* and his Associates, the Nation ceased to be Pagan; since which time, Bishops have not alwaies been so revered and honoured as the Reverend Author of this Epistle pretends. Their disloyalty and

pri e

But might
 find. vide
 Subscripti
 Conciliis
 Ant. latine
 is. 1. H
 v. p. m. d.
 Brit. p. m.
 Eccl. Pri-
 mors.
 pag. 795.

pride rendred them so odious in the Reigns of many Kings, that had it been put to the Vote, whether there should have been Bishops or no Bishops, it is easy enough to see how it would have been carried. Nor is it truly said *page 133. That we owe our Reformation to the Care and Zeal of our Bishops, who did so wonderfully well repurge the Church of England an hundred years ago.*

The first dawnings of Reformation we owe under God, to *Wickliff*, who was no Bishop, nor friend to Bishops; as Bishops signifie men of a superior Order to Presbyters, those who sealed the Truth with their Bloud, in King *Henry* the eighths dayes, were none of them Bishops: We can prove from the writings they have left behind them, that they were against Bishops. Seeing this Letter is so well penned Mr. *Durells* anger will not wax hot; if I dwell upon it a little longer The Author of it tells us *page 139 That he fears not to say, if the French had kept Bishops and as many Ceremonies, as would serve to fix the attention of the people without Superstition, they should have seen for certain far greater progresses of Reformation, and the resistance of a great many persons overcome, who are frighted from their Communion by*

the

the irregularity of their Government, and the bareness of their Service. I design not to put this Reverend Pastor into any fright because of any thing that he hath said, but really I do not understand what he means by [the Reformed French keeping their Bishops] for I never heard that they had any Bishops of their Religion to part with; much less do I understand upon what he founds his certain asseverations that more Papists would have come over to them, if they had had Bishops and more Ceremonies. We had before the Wars Bishops in our Nation, and Ceremonies enough; yet did we not find any great additions made to our Churches by the coming in of Recusants. I hope they in *France* can reckon up more Converts from Popery, than we can here in *England*, or else Conversions have been but rare. I also hope, that so many have not apostatized among them, as have apostatized among us: If they have, *Rome* hath more to boast of than I could wish. But there is one thing more marvellous than all this; The Author of the Letter thinks, That if the English Dissenters have any Charity, they would consent to the Re-establishment of the Episcopal Government, though there were something in it they could not approve of: if it were but for the sake
of

of those that follow the Confession of Asburg. For can this learned man think, that Hierarchy, as an Order superiour to Presbytery, and as founded upon a Divine Institution, would be an Offering well pleasing to the *Lutheran* Divines? he is not so unacquainted with their Writings as that he can so think. *If Episcopacy upholds the Lutheran Churches*, as he tells us page 138. I am sure it is not such an Episcopacy as we have here in *England*; for such an Episcopacy hath no place among them. And oh that it could be said, *That they in Denmarke, Norway, Sweden, and Germany, were very quiet under the Episcopal Government, seldom seen to slander and tear one another.* We know they have their differences, and that none are more molested, than the moderate party among them: so far was Episcopal Government from keeping us quiet in *England*, that the Divisions and Animosities did arise and grow to a great height among the Bishops themselves. Some were told that nothing but their Bishopricks kept them from being Puritans: Others were told, that nothing but their Wives kept them from being Papists. Sundry Parliaments complained to the King of the growth of Arminianisme, and what did the Church do, to prevent or take away the

the ground and cause such Complaints? truly Dr. *Heylin* in his *History of Laud*, tells us, that there was a Consultation whether it were meet to bring the thing to a Convocation; but it was concluded, that it was not safe so to do; because there were too many Members of the Convocation inclined to Calvinisme, though there were some that were as strangely inclined to Arminianisme, our Pulpits had not failed to ring with Declamations against Pelagianisme in some places, and against Stoicall Fatality in others, had not the King by a Proclamation, put some stop to those Controversies: so that the quietness which the Church enjoyed, was rather due to Monarchy than Episcopacy. Now of late indeed, *Arnold Polenberg* in his preface to the second Tome of *Episcopius* his works, gives us to understand, that he designed to dedicate that great Folio to our *English* Clergy, and particularly to both our Universities; promising himself, that almost all the Bishops of our Churches do defend that Opinion concerning Predestination, which was condemned in the Synod of Dort: Whether he be out in his account, 'tis not for me to enquire, who have work enough to do at home, but it seems even in this Gentlemans account, all our Bishops are not become Episcopian, and therefore preserve U-

nity among themselves, by having their knowledge in those matters unto themselves. Now if it be found necessary to tolerate difference of Judgment among the Bishops themselves in Doctrines of so high concernment? it may be worth the Consideration of those who are in Authority, whether they also may not be suffered to enjoy Ecclesiastical preferment, who differ from their Bretheren only in some few points of Discipline: I say in a few points of Discipline, for as to the essentials of Discipline I am not so quick-sighted, as to find that we disagree. The things that breed discord among us, are said, by those who are the chief causes of their imposition, to be *Adiaphorons*, (*i.e.*) such things as are therefore good because imposed, rather than imposed because good. On the other hand, those who suffer for not yeilding to the Impositions, do judge there is some evil in the things imposed, and desire they may be indulged not to Practise them. A Bookish man who is not much versed in the Intrigues of Ecclesiasticall Policy, would think no bigger a breach than this, might easily be stopped up.

I shall dismiss this Letter, only adding, That I would not have Mounseur *Le-Moy* estimated by it, having certain knowledge that he hath both with his tongue and
pen

pen declared, that Mr. *Durell* hath much abused him, in leaving out sundry passages in his Letter wherein he did moderate and regulate the Episcopal power, which if they had been inserted, the Letter would not at all have fitted his design.

Lastly, it plainly appears, that Mr. *Durell* is no observer of the Act of Uniformity, for he over and over confesseth, that he hath suffered those to preach in his Church, who had no Episcopal Ordination, which is a Crime severely to be punished by the Act. And I much doubt whether Mr. *Durell* himself be qualified to be a Preacher in *England*; for though he make shift to tell us, that he was Ordained by a *Scotch* Bishop, yet it is probable enough, that that Bishop was Ordained Presbyter, by Presbyters; or at least by those, who never had themselves any Ordination to be Presbyters, but by Presbyters: and if so, there was an error in the first Concoction, and we know that is not to be corrected. Our Bishops lately took care to prevent this scruple, and consecrated Mr. *Sharp* first Deacon, then Priest, then Bishop, &c. But we are sure from History, that the first Bishops who came over hither to receive Ordination, were not so dealt with: and therefore Mr. *Durell* may do well to consider upon what ground he

stands, and whether according to the Principle now prevailing, he be not still a Laick.

I have one Catalogue more to give you still, and that will consist of things which Country men call Whiskers; you may if you please more civilly call them, *Durellisms*, I shall not reckon up all, but yet I must be allowed to mention some.

The first occurs, page 31. *I know none that did ever so much as move the question, in what place, and which way the Communion Table ought to stand, so it be seated where the people may hear and see, except the new Scotch and English Presbyterians.*

A man must have a large measure of Charity that can think him ignorant, that there were great questions moved among our Bishops themselves, concerning the placing of the Communion Table: and some did urge Ministers to read Service there, though it was demonstrated that the one; halfe of the people could neither see nor hear them.

A second I find page 32. *In all Reformed Churches men use to enter into the places of Publick Worship with their Hats off.*

This is a most notorious — nothing being more usual in some Reformed Churches than to pass through and through the places of Worship, never stirring their Hats: But if he would have the saying understood of mens putting off their Hats when

when
Wor
ship
when
tlem

T
profe
ther
bois
Com
some
all
sober

T
zen
teria
Past
ed
year
when
relig
mit
sober
cipl
phr
nion
only
did
rec
Ter
is n

when they enter into the place of Publick Worship, whilst the Congregation is Worshipping, then must this speech be placed where it is already placed, among the Gentlemans impertinencies.

Thirdly, page 44. he averrs, *That those who profess themselves to be Orthodox, either altogether neglected the Lords Supper for many years in both Universities, that of Oxford having had no Communion for above 12 years; or only admitted some few choice persons to the same, refusing it to all others, though their outward carriage were sober, honest, and religious.*

There are hundreds of Scholars and Citizens know this to be an untruth; no Presbyterian in the University of *Oxford*, that had a Pastoral Charge, or any thing like it, neglected to administer the Sacrament for many years, or for any one year; or refused any whose conversation was sober, honest, and religious. Some of them were blamed for admitting such whose conversation was not so sober and religious, as all Rules of good Discipline do require in Church-members. The phrase, *That of Oxford having had no Communion for above 12 years*, perhaps was intended only to bear this sence, That the University did not for above 12 years meet together to receive the Sacrament in *St. Maries* before the Terms: If this be any fault, the Presbyterian is not concerned in it. In those 12 years time,
there

there were but four Vice-Chancellors, all of them right-worthy persons, but not one of them professing himself a Presbyterian. But indeed it may be question'd, whether it was *veri nominis crimen*, not to keep up that Sacrament. For I wonder who made the University, as the University, a Church? or who is the Pastour of that Church? what Bishop hath Jurisdiction over it? or who shall Excommunicate those Members that come not to the Ordinance? I never heard that ever the hundred part of the University was at that Sacrament when administred, or that any one man was ever censured for being absent from it: nay I believe the Statute injoyning this Sacrament in that Church, will be found a spick and span new Statute, coyned on purpose to inure the Scholars to Bowing towards the Altar.

Fourthly, In the same page, and the very next words, we have an Assertion as void of all Truth, *viz. That all the Reformed world over, no man that is not a notorious ill Liver is debarred from that Comfort which Christ hath left to his Church for the sick and weak as a Medicine against their Diseases.*

Had it been said that all the Reformed World over, no one is to be debarred from the Sacrament by the Rules of Discipline, but a notorious ill Liver, the Assertion had had some modesty, but what intolerab

tolerable impudence is it for any man to arrogate so much to himself as to adventure to say no man is debarred indeed in all Reformed Churches: others are to be debarred besides notorious ill Livers, namely the ignorant and those that have any heretical opinions, which they make known, yea, and all those who cannot satisfie themselves to conform to all the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Churches, if we may believe Mr. *Durell* himself. Yet I trow, there's no necessity such should be notorious evil Livers.

Fifthly, Pag. 61. He finds a forehead to leave these words on Record, *It is said that the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas take those things in which they differ from the Reformed Church of England, to be sinful and that therefore they would have her to conform to them.* By whom was this ever said? either in so many words, or in any expressions tantamount? and how would Mr. *Durell* have this uncouth affirmation to be understood? universally, or particularly? It should be understood universally, or else Mr. *Durell*'s going about to prove the Negative is very needless; and if it be so understood, he might as well have charged us to say, that the Reformed Churches count it a sin in the *English Church* to use her own Native Language. The *French Ministers* preach with their Hats on, did ever Nonconformist
say,

say, that they count it sinful in us to preach with our hats off? or did ever Nonconformist go about to bring the *French* mode into his Church?

Sixthly, Pag. 85. he acquaints us, *That the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas are told, that the Convocations of the Church of England consist onely of Archbishops and Bishops, and that the inferiour Clergy are not admitted to sit and vote in them.*

Till any persons be produc'd who told the Reformed Churches any such tales, Mr. Durell must be content to be thought a spreader of false informations; if he can produce any such, by my consent let him have the whetstone and keep it untill he can find Mr. Durell telling something that will make him deserve to have it returned. But he shall not need to keep it very long: For

Seventhly, Pag. 86. he tells us, *That the Bishops in England are to rule by the Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, and by the Laws of the Land and no otherwise; calling alwaies to join with them in imposition of hands, and other matters of weighty concernment, some of the Prebends of their Cathedralls, or other grave Ministers of the Diocess.*

Where was shame when this was pen'd? do the Canons require any Bishop to call any one Minister to join with him in imposition of hands upon a Deacon, or in the Confirmation of persons

persons before they are admitted to the Lords Supper ? or doth the Bishop offend against any Law or Canon, if he call none of his Ministers to joyn with him, when a Presbyter is Excommunicated ? or is it so much as necessary, that the Bishop himself should be present, when Excommunication is decreed ? Is any thing more usual, then for Lay-Chancellors to decree Excommunication ? calling only some Minister for fashion sake to pronounce the sentence : I would Mr. *Durell* would shew us any Reformed Church that hath any such custom ; and I wish also he would tell us, what those Canons and Constitutions are, according to which our Bishops are to rule us : For some tell us, that they are to proceed not only according to the Canons of 1603. but also according to sundry other Canons that ordinary people know not, nor ever had an opportunity to read of ; provided they be not repugnant to the Laws and Statutes of the Nation. Mr. *Durell* 'tis like hath all the 77. Legatine Canons, as also the 212 Provincial Canons, at his fingers ends ; If he can find any Canon among them all, commanding our Bishops to call in some of the Presbyters to joyn with them in imposition of hands, and all other weighty matters, let him discharge it in their faces ; yet taking heed lest it recoyle, and do himself some mischief : For Bishops do not love to have their power limited, or

the Canons relating to it expounded, by any but themselves. I hope no Canons are in force but those of 1603. and by them I am sure the Bishop is not required, to call in Presbyters to joyn with him, in every imposition of hands. In the 31 Canon indeed, *he is appointed to celebrate Ordinations on the four Sundays after the Ember weeks, and in the Cathedral or Parish Church where the Bishop resideth, and in the time of Divine Service, in the presence not only of the Archdeacon, but of the Dean and two Prebendaries at the least; or if they be let or hindred, in the presence of four Grave persons, Masters of Art, and allowed Preachers.* The 35 Canon also saith, *That the Bishop shall diligently examine him that is to be admitted to Holy Orders, in the presence of those that shall assist him at the imposition of hands; or else cause the said Ministers carefully to examine every such person.* All this doth not amount to the calling in of Presbyters to joyn with him in the imposition of hands. The Book of ordering Priests and Deacons, doth indeed require, that the Priests that are present with the Bishop, shall together with him lay on their hands when a Priest is ordained; but how if no Priest should lay on his hand, the Ordination is valid however, as is again and again determined by Bishop Taylor, in his Episcopacy asserted. Yea he saith, pag. 197, 198. *That it was declared Hereſie to communicate the power of giving Orders*

*Apud Pongian Concili: part. 2. pag. 28. et
ibi. Can: 22. 23. 24.*

ders to Presbyters, either alone or in conjunction with Bishops. What he saith concerning the Decree of the 4th. Council of Carthage, pag. 189. I leave to others to examine, confessing that I innocently thought, that when our Presbyters laid on hands together with the Bishop, they as well as he had conferred Orders; Dr. Heylin in his History of Episcopacy, pag. 162. hath undeceiv'd me, for these are his words: *The conjunction of the Presbyters in the solemnities of this Act, was more for the honour of the Priesthood, than for the essence of the work: Nor did the laying on of the Presbyters hands, conferr upon the party that was ordained any power or order, but only testified their consent unto the business, and approbation of the man.*

I must also confess that I did not apprehend things aright, in reference to the Bishop and his Presbyters, untill lately I read in the fore-said Bishop Taylor, p. 257, 258. *That to the Bishop is committed the care of the whole Diocess. He it is who is appointed by peculiar designation to feed the flock. The Presbyters are admitted in partem sollicitudinis, but still the jurisdiction of the whole Diocess is in the Bishop, and without the Bishops admission to a part of it, per tradit onem subditorum, although the Presbyter by his Ordination have a capacity of Preaching and Administering Sacraments, yet he cannot exercise this without designation of a particular charge, either*

temporary or fixed, and p. 262. after he had mustered up many Testimonies, he tells us, *They shew that the Presbyters in their several charges, whether of temporary mission or fixed residence, be but Delegates and Vicars of the Bishop, to assist the Bishop in his great charge of the whole Diocese,* And p. 282, 283. he hath these words. *As I have shewn that the Bishop of every D^y. did give Laws to his own Church for particulars, so it is evident that the Laws of Provinces and of the Catholick Church, were made by Conventions of Bishops, without the intervening or concurrence of Presbyters or any else, for sentence and decision; The instances of these are just so many as there are Councils, and more plainly 287. Till the Council of Basil, the Church never admitted Presbyters, as in their own right to voice in Councils and that Council we know favor'd too much of the Schismatick. Nay Mr. Jeans tells me, That in the Convocation which was the last before the late wars, Bishop Pierce told the Ministers of his Diocese, that it was an unquestionable Priviledge due unto his See, for him to propound unto them the Clerks that they should choose, unto which he expected their Conformity, part. 2. pag. 131. Now if all this should be true, it might be a kind of a Quodlibetical Question, whether in our Conventions any do sit and vote beside the Bishops, for they that sit not in their own rights, but in the right of others, and as they are Delegates and Substitutes, are scarce said to sit:*

And

*Bold, but
evidently
false.*

And so the men whom Mr. *Durell* so much condemns for false accusations will be found rather to have spoken incautelously than falsely : As for the other false accusation relating to Archbishop *Laud*, that he should make a Liturgy differing from the Liturgies of *Q. Eliz.* and *K. James*, and *K. Charles I.* I must needs say, that is no false accusation. Mounſieur *Chabret* in his Letter recorded, pag. 82. *Doth not say that it was reported Archbishop Laud had compiled a new Liturgy for the Church of England, but onely that a new one was compiled by him: which had occasioned much clamour, and been the ground of fears and jealousies.* Now I beseech Mr. *Durell* to tell me. Did not Archbishop *Laud* compile a Liturgy for the *Scotch* Nation? if he did not, let those who have charged him so to do, in allowed writings be confuted; If he did compile that Liturgy, or which is all one, direct those who compiled it; I am sure it did differ from ours, and occasioned much clamour, raised many fears and jealousies, which at last ended in a war betwixt the two Nations. Yea, there were some few alterations made by the said Archbishop or some of his Creatures in the Liturgy for our own Church, which were not very well relished by those that never were enemies to the legally established Government, what those alterations were may be seen in the Dedicatory of Mr. *Prynne's Quench Con.*

But

But I must give check to my running pen, and take notice of some other failures against truth p. 8. Mr. Durell thus Paraphrasieth, *Oecolampadius* who reformed the City of Basil, is stiled Bishop of that Church upon his Tomb, of which Bellarmine himself was an eye witnes in his time much against his will, for this we are referred to *Bellar. de notis Eccles. l. 4 c. 8.* where *Bellar.* indeed does tell us, That he was at Basil, and there saw the inscription on *Oecolampadius* his Tomb, and read it not without laughter. Now it is hard to conceive that he should see that much against his will, the sight whereof caused laughter in him, but the truth is, *Bellar.* laughter was ridiculous, for the words upon the Tomb are not *Primus hujus urbis Episcopus*, as *Bellar.* quotes them, but *Author Evangelicae doctrine in hac urbe primus*: *Episcopus* indeed he is called, but how? *Hujus Templi verus Episcopus*, and if such an *Episcopus* will do, Mr. Durell any pleasure, he must be a very humourfome man that will envy him such a pleasure.

Ninthly, Page 13. He fears not to affirme, That all understanding men among the French Churches say plainly, that if God Almighty were pleased that all France should embrace the Reformed Religion, as England hath; the Episcopal Government must of necessity be established in their Churches. That all understanding men should say this and say it plainly, is certainly a ———

all understanding men were never heard to

spea

Bo.
cui
fal

spea
cal
any
it is
brace
for
the
what
gene
that
shed
saw
derst
to sa
cessa
T
verio
the
not
of So
the
Judg
their
Wh
the
pre
cer
as t
be
the
Re
wh

and speak about this matter; and should they be called together to speak, they would not utter any such speech as is here fathered on them: it is scarce sence, to say if all *France* should embrace the Reformed Religion as *England* hath; for certainly all *England* hath not embraced the Reformed Religion, the more the pity: and what necessity could there be if *France* should generally embrace the Reformed Religion, that Episcopal Government should be established in it? I am not more certain that ever I saw the Sun, than I am certain that many understanding *Frenchmen* will never be brought to say, that Episcopal Government must necessarily be established.

Tenthly, *Page 27.* Having told us the *Helvetick* Confession does vehemently approve of the observation of some Holy-days, he dreads not to tell us, *That the Ministers of the Church of Scotland subscribed that Confession An. 1566. the Ministers of that Church being then of another Judgment, and of a temper far different from that their Successors have shewed of latter years.* Whereas the *Scotch* Ministers who subscribed the *Helvetick* Confession, subscribed it with express exception of that part of it which concerns the observation of the Holy-days; and so as to that matter plainly shewed themselves to be of the same temper and Judgment with their Successors, as plainly appears from the Records of that Church. Let the World judge what credit is to be given to Mr. *Durell* concern-

cerning remote Churches, who relates things so contrary to truth about a neighbour Church.

Eleventhly, *Page 28.* He would perswade us, *That the Croſſes have not been pulled down from the top of Churches, unleſs perhaps in ſom popular Storm;* but we can tell him of Croſſes that have been taken from the top of Churches by the Magiſtrates appointment, and with the Miniſters aprobatation, which things are not to be found in a popular Storm.

Twelfthly, *P. 29.* He bears us in hand, *That the Bohemians have ſolemn dedication of Churches, which Ceremony is to be performed with them by the Biſhop in the ſame manner as with us here in England.* Which words I know not how to reconcile to truth: For what Law is there among us enjoining Churches to be Conſecrated by a Biſhop; or where may a man find the form and manner of Conſecrating a Church here in *England*, or read the Prayers with the which the Conſecration is to be performed: how ſhall I be able to convince Pariſhoners that they are bound to deſire the Conſecration of their newly built, or newly enlarged Churches, or the Biſhop that he is bound to undertake this Conſecra.. though he be not deſired, and muſt the Dioceſan bear the charges of his journey, or have them born by the people, ſundry ſuch questions as theſe need reſolution, which is a ſign that the Laws and Canons now in force, concern not themſelves at all in this buſineſſ of Conſecraition.

Thirteenthly,

13thly. Pag. 30. Mr. D. bears witness against the Directorians, which is either nonsense or a falsity, for these are his words; At "*Bazil* in the Cathedral Church they have "their Fonts of Stone, and use them for the "baptism of Infants as we do here; they have " & use them alike in the City of *Breme*; "and so in other places; by which we see "they are not of the same judgment with the "Directorians, who find Popery and Superstition in the very placing of them: If the meaning of these words be, that the Directorians find Popery and Superstition in placing of Fonts as they are placed at *Bazil* and *Breme*, it is a perfect calumny; if the meaning be that the Directorians find Popery and Superstition in some kind of placing of the Fonts, how can a man thence gather, that they of *Breme* and *Bazil* are not of the same judgment with the Directorians: all that the Directory orders is, that Baptisme be administered in the face of the Congregation, where the people may most conveniently see and hear, and not in the places where Fonts in the time of Popery were unfitly and superstitiously placed: Here is no finding of Popery and Superstition in the very placing of Fonts, but onely a prohibiting the administration of Baptisme in the places where Fonts in the time of Popery were unfitly and

superstitiously placed; and what, I wonder, could move the Papists to place their Fonts where the Congregation could neither hear nor see the Minister, what I say, but meer Superstition?

14thly. Page 42. He falls again to the abusing of Presbyterians, saying, "That they ought to have as bad an Opinion of the Trine asperision of the Cross in Baptisme; adding towards the end of that Page his confidence, "That if the Trine asperision were used in our Church, or if she had retained the Trine immersion, as at the beginning of King *Edward the Sixth's* Reign, it would be counted a great Superstition. This is a great slander, no Presbyterians that ever I heard of, have any such Principles from which they can charge Superstition upon Trine immersion, or upon Trine asperision: they say, it is the command of God that water should be applied to the Baptized, had he commanded that this applitation should be by dipping or sprinkling once or twice, his command must have been observed; seeing there is no such Command, they say, that Superiours are at liberty to appoint which they please, provided nothing be appointed that is imprudent or uncharitable: and now that we are fallen upon this point, I would gladly know what it is that

our

our Church hath appointed ; by the Liturgy. I see the Minister is appointed to dipp the Child in the water, if the Sponsors certifie that the Babe can well endure it ; but if they certifie that the Child is weak, it shall suffice to pour water upon it ; so that here is no allowance of any Rite but Dipping, unless there be a Certificate of the Childs weakness : But when, I wonder, did any Baptist demand such a Certificate ? as for the *Quoties* no meaner a man than Bishop *Mountague* in his Articles of Visitation positively asserted, that the Child is thrice to be aspersed with water on the face : So that the Act of Uniformity notwithstanding, it seems the Doctors of the Church were not agreed, and for ought I can observe notwithstanding any Rubrick or Canon now in force, Ministers are at their Liberty to apply the water once or thrice, though I think Bishop *Mountague* was much mistaken, when he said that the Child was thrice to be aspersed ; the Church hath not commanded Trine aspersion, but there is no *constat* that she hath forbidden it. Nor is this the only thing in our Administration of Baptisme, about which I am at a loss. Immersion I do hugely approve, yea, I cannot see how it can be forboren, unless charity or modesty, or something of that nature do forbid it. But what may be the Reason that

our Church allows not pouring water upon Infants without a Certificate that they are weak; and yet in the form of Baptism appointed for adult persons, leaves it wholly at the Ministers discretion, either to dip them into the water, or to pour water upon them. There is another thing in which *aqua mihi heret*. I am marvellously also perplext about the Administrator or Administratrix of Baptism. In the *Hampton-Court* Conference, K. James stumbled something at some expressions in our Liturgy which seemed to give Liberty to women and Maids to Administer Baptisme in case of extreme necessity, and he was then answer'd by Archbishop *Whitgift*, that Baptism by Women and Laypersons, was not allow'd in the practise of the Church, but was enquired of, and censur'd in the Bishops Visitations, and that the words in the Book inferred no such meaning. But Bishop *Bancroft* declared, that the Church by those words did intend in case of necessity, a permission of private persons to Baptize, and that this permission was agreeable to the practise of the ancient Churches: Withal opening the absurdities and impieties of their Opinion who think there is no necessity of Baptisme: I confess, I could not but wonder that they who had so strongly pleaded for the Liturgy, and
pleas'd

pleas'd themselves in silencing those who could not conform unto it, should be as contrary as North and South in expounding a material passage of it : But however for the credit of the Ordinance, I rejoyced greatly to find that at the motion of the King, it was ordred that the words, *A Lawful Minister*, should be put into the Rubrick, for by this means I thought us sufficiently secured against any female Baptiz-ers. But he who doth not love to conceal any thing Dr. P. H. in his necessary Introduction to the History of Bishop Land, pag. 27. hath quite took away the cause of my rejoycing; for he saith, " The alteration was greater in sound than sense, it being the Opinion of many great Clerks, that any man in cases of extreme necessity, who can pronounce the words of Baptism, may pass in the notation of & account of a lawful Minister. By any man, I suppose, he means any one that is *de humano genere*, and by consequence either a Child or a Natural; but I hope some one will give check to this extravagant Notion, that so a stop may be put to the Licentiousness of those, unto whom God hath no more given a power to Baptize, than to Ordain Ministers. And therefore I wish that to stop this gap, instead of the Minister of the Parish, or any other lawful Minister, it had been said,

the

the lawful Minister of any other Parish; and then I should have thought it impossible for any man to be so impudent as to opine that our Church had not restrained Baptisme to the Clergy. But they who made our new Liturgy were wiser then I; and some that have subscrib'd it, it seems had got some such way of Interpretation as no Logick ever led me into.

15thly. Pag. 103. He makes bold with the whole Church of *England*: For of her, these are his words: "She holdeth subordination of Ministers in the Christian Church to be of Apostolical, nay, of Divine Institution, having as she conceiveth for Grounds of this her Judgment besides Scripture, the Practise of the Holy Apostles in their time, of the Universal Church ever since, until this later Age; and which is more, of Christ himself, who ordained the Apostles, and the Seventy Disciples in an imparity as two distinct Orders of Ministers in his Church. I suppose this Reverend Prædicant doth not pretend to any faculty of discerning the secret thoughts and inward conceptions of our Churches heart, farther then when she discov'rs them by some words or other signification; let him therefore tell us where the Church hath declared her self thus to hold, thus to conceive as in the

the fore-quoted words is represented, That the Church holds subordination of Ministers to be an Apostolical Institution is plain enough; and therefore Mr. D. beats the Air as oft as he brings any Testimonies for Episcopacie, which do not place it among Apostolical Institutions: but I cannot finde that the Church any where distinguisheth Apostolical and Divine; much less doth she say, that she hath besides Scripture the practice of the Apostles, and of Christ himself. The Practice of the Apostles and Christ himself are recorded in Scripture, and be a part of Scripture, and therefore it is not sense to say that she hath these Arguments besides Scripture, unless she thinks that these are not Scriptural Arguments: Besides, where doth our Church say, *Christ ordained the Apostles and Seventy Disciples in an imparity, as two distinct Orders of Ministers in his Church;* possibly some Writers of our Church may so say, our Church, I believe will never be found to have said any such thing: if she have, the Speech hath given her Adversaries too much advantage, for they will ask in what order Christ placed the Seventy? If in the Order of Presbyters how came some of them afterwards to be made Deacons as it is generally held that some of them were in the *Acts* of the Apostles.

16thly. Pag. 144. He leaves upon record 4 great Untruths, and yet makes them or 3 of them to be Truths known to all the three Kingdoms: they all relate to the Presbyterians, the first is, "That they had no set Forms, nor indeed would admit of any "whether for Common-Prayer, or Administration of the Sacraments, Matrimony, &c. How doth he know they had no set Forms for these, or some of these? I believe sundry of them had Forms, or *quasi*-forms for all these, and I am confident the Major part of them would, if need required, swear that they never declared that they would not receive any set Forms for these. But Secondly, he saith, "That for a long time many of "them had left off using that very Form our "Lord hath taught us: Pag. 37. he had said, *That most if not all the Directorians had for a long time here in England left it out of their Service*: But wisely then adds, *It will be hard to make Transmarine Brethren believe, that there were any such men among us.* And certainly it will be impossible to make our own Nation believe that this had any truth in it; for it is known all the Nation over, that those whom he must mean by the Presbyterians, did many, if not most of them, and that very often, use the Lords Prayer, though they did not think it their Duty

Duty to use it every time they officiated in publick. I my self for some years attended upon a Lecture in this Nation, carried on by thirteen persons, asl of them used the Lords Prayer, and usually concluded their Prayers with it. I should wrong the English Presbyterian Nonconformists should I not here acknowledg that they have very wel deserv'd of the Church of Christ by their Pious and Learned Discourses and Sermons upon the Lords Prayer: I believe no Church can shew a more full and profitable Treatise of it than that compos'd by Mr. *John Ball*, and published by his loving Friend Mr. *Simeon Ash*, towards the end of a Book, Entitled, *The Power of Godliness*; nor do I know that ever the use of the Lords Prayer was more fully Apologiz'd for, against the Exceptions of the Brownists and others, than by Mr. *Paget*, and Mr. *Thom. Hodges*, the one sundry years since dead in the Lord, the other still in the Land of the Living. Oh that I had so much reason to commend the Zeal of all the Episcopal Ministers of my Acquaintance! But indeed I have not; Sundry of them whose parts I greatly esteemed I have known to conclude their Prayers before Sermon without any use of the Lords Prayer, as oft as they could conceive that there was any Great Person in the Congregation, who

P would

would think the worse of them for using it.

To conclude this business, I Question not but it is both lawful and expedient to use the Lords Prayer, as a Prayer as well as a pattern; but let not Mr. D. too severely censure those who cannot as yet obtain leave of themselves to use it as a Prayer, especially at such times when they have before prayed largely both for themselves and others; for where can he find a Law making it our duty to use those words commonly called the Lords Prayer, any otherwise than as a pattern and example of our Prayers. I know he somewhere produceth the words of St. *Luke*, *When ye pray, say, &c.* But were those words brought into the form of a Syllogism, it would not to the Brownists themselves appear very formidable; for they will ask what the words be that Christ there commands to use: if it should be answered them, the words that follow in St. *Luke's* Gospel, then would they reply, that all who tye themselves to the use of our English Liturgy would be transgressours of this Law; for no where in all the Liturgy does the Lords Prayer occur as it is recorded in St. *Luke's* Gospel. Indeed the Compilers of our Liturgy do neither follow St. *Matthew* nor St. *Luke*, but vary from them both, as

will

will appear to any that shall compare the Lords Prayer in the Liturgy, with the Lords Prayer in the New Testament, whether of the last or former Translation. But if it should be said to them that the Commandment requires only that words be used to the same sense and purpose with those in St. Luke; then is the Brownist at as great Liberty as he could wish; They who lay it as a burden upon our Consciences to use the same words in English that the Evangelists used in Greek, should do well clearly to satisfy us, what words were used by the Evangelists, for in no other matter do the Copies more vary. I have enough to satisfy my self, that the Doxology in *Matthew* was not added in later times, as some think; but if any one should differ from me in this Opinion, I should be loath to tie my self neither to eat nor drink, till I had convinced him. *Grotius* tells me that it is in the Syriack and Arabick Translations, yea, and in the Latine too; but I am sure it is not in that Arabick Translation exhibited to us in our late *Polyglotts*, and it is in very few Latine Translations, if any that are considerable. *Amen* is wanting in the very Syriack Translation, which all Scholars acknowledge to be ancient; but how shall I be able to persuade a dissenter, that this Syriack Translation,

which we follow, is the Ancientest in that kind; If it be the Ancientest, then must I needs acknowledge that from thence may be fetched a very good Argument for the Antiquity of Holy-dayes: But perhaps it is not the Ancientest: that which *Immanuel Tremelius* followed, having no such Inscriptions and various Titles; by which is signified that these and the other things were done certain dayes in the Year; How should I convince him that would say, *Our Father* only, and not, *Our Father which art in Heaven*, or him that would use fewer Petitions by two, then we commonly use, or him that would not say, *Amen*, at the end of the Prayer. Above all things this makes me that I dare not too confidently assert that our Lord Jesus intended to make it the Duty of his Disciples after his departure to use those very words which he delivered to them, because I do not find in those words any mention of his own most sweet & precious Name: whereas when he comes to give them a standing Directory for Prayer, he enjoyns them, *John 16* to ask in his Name, assuring them that Prayers made in his Name should be answered, but letting them know withal, that at that time they had never asked any thing in his Name, what shall we say to this? If we should say, that the Apostles,

Christis

Christ's Directions notwithstanding, had never used his Prayer, the Brownists will make an advantage of such a Confession; if we should say, that though they used the Lords Prayer, yet by using of it they had not prayed in the Name of Christ, *i. e.* explicite-ly, and so as they were to do, after they had a more explicite knowledge of the Nature and Offices of Christ; then though this prayer will still contain all needful matter to be prayed for, yet it will admit of Dispute, whether our prayers are not to be tendered unto God in such phrases and forms as do more distinctly mention the Death, Resurrection, and Intercession of our Blessed Mediator. Granting the Doxology to be a part of the Lords Prayer, as I am of a strong Opinion it is, it is plain that it is not so distinct and particular as some others in the Epistles and Revelations be, which offer and ascribe praise and Glory unto God by Christ, as *Eph. 3. 21.* or unto Christ, as *1 Timothy 6. 16.* or to God and the Lamb Christ Jesus, as *Rev. 5. 13.* Later Doxologies do make an acknowledgment of the Blessed Trinity as to every Person. *Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost:* and it seems but meet that the Doxologies of Christians (properly so called) should have something in them, to distinguish

guish them from the Doxologies and Supplications not only of Heathens, but also of Jews. There be some that say our Lord took this form of prayer out of the Jewish Liturgies, and one undertakes to give us an account from the Jewish Liturgies, of that variety and difference that is to be found in the recital of it in *Mathew* and *Luke*, viz. he would have us think that the prayer, as in *Mathew* was intended for the Disciples more publick use, as in *Luke* for their more private use : But in all this that Learned Man does need a credulous Reader, who will not too strictly enquire into the grounds of his asseveration; Most plain it is, that our Savior made this Prayer for his Disciples, whilst they were Members of the Jewish Church, and before he had blotted out the Hand-writing of Ordinances, or had sent the Spirit to lead them into all Truth : let it therefore be considered, whether we are not rather ordinarily to express our selves in a Dialect more sutable to the New Testament Dispensation, than is used in the Lords Prayer, yet using that prayer also, as a prayer, and making it the patern and example; as to the things to be prayed for, in all the prayers that we make; and let men have a care how they adventure to conclude their own prayers :] thus we further pray unto thee in that

very

very form of words which Christ himself hath taught us,] till they have made themselves certain what form of words Christ did use when he directed his Disciples. 3dly. he saith, " Most of them had likewise wholly neglected the use of the Lords Supper " for many years. He might with as much truth have said, that most of them for many years had lived without eating and drinking; [The most of them ministred the Sacraments frequently, and I know where they have been blamed for administering it too frequently : if this Characterizer say this is not a truth, he may chance in a short time by printed Testimonials to see himself confuted : But he hath not done, but for a Conclusion tells us, " There was a great irreverence at Prayer in their Congregations, " very few kneeling, many not so much as " putting off their Hats, and of this, he " saith, he was an Eye-witness. I demand only whether he think it be irreverence for a man not to kneel in the publick Congregation in time of Prayer? Whether standing be not a posture of Reverence? Whether in the *London* Churches it be not morally impossible for the one half of the Congregation to kneel in time of Prayer? Into how many Congregations he went where many did not so much as put off their Hats in the

time

time of Prayer ? And whether he either saw or heard that the Ministers of those Churches did any way countenance that irreverence ? If he cannot answer these Questions roundly and readily, oh, what work hath he made for an accusing Conscience ! For ought I know those in whom he observed this irreverence, might be Sectaries, who did more bitterly inveigh against Presbyterians than against any other men whatever ; perhaps also they might be Episcopal-men, who designed to put an affront upon the Presbyterians Prayers : just as now some are observed to sit upon their Breech all the time of Pulpit-prayer, unless when just the Lords Prayer is repeating, because forsooth Pulpit-prayer is not allowed by the Church, but onely bidding of Prayer. I write it with grief, but I must write it, I never in any Congregations where I have been, observed so much irreverence as I have observed in those in which there is the greatest abundance of such as alwayes pretended a love to the English Liturgy ; particular Stories I might relate, and would relate did I not fear to set deluded people at a greater distance from our Assemblies ; but if Mr. D. will call for them, he shal have them by the peck & by the bushel ; I need not stay about these particulars : the World I trust will not long want
 s. ff.

sufficient information how much the Presbyterians have been abus'd by Mercenary Pens.

I have only two Animadversions on this Authors Sermon, and then your trouble will not be much longer continued. *Pag. 20.* He tells us, *That those who have Devotion and leisure enough to come to Church, and be present at Divine Service may hear the whole Bible read every year, the Old Testament once, and the new no less than thrice.* A man scarce knows where to be present at Divine Service every day morning & evening, unless at some Cathedral or Collegiate Church; for though all Priests and Deacons are appointed to say daily the Morning and Evening Prayer, either privately, or openly, not being let by Sickness, or some other urgent cause, and though Curats be appointed being at home, and not otherwise reasonably hindred, to say the Prayers in the Parish Church, or Chappel, and to toll the Bell that the people may come and hear the word and pray with them, yet the Assenters, and Consenters that do this, are as rare as black Swans, and if a man had health and Devotion so much as to inable him to attend upon the Cathedral Service Morning and Evening from the first of *January* to the last of *December*, yet should he not by that means hear the whole

Q

Bible

Bible read, either the Old Testament once, or the New Testament thrice, there being several Chapters in both, that are never appointed to be read.

Whether the Church do well to appoint above an hundred of Apocryphal Chapters to be read, and about an hundred eighty eight Canonical Chapters, never to be read, is *ἐλέγας οὐδέ τις*, certainly he that would adventure, in a Sermon to say, *de facto*, That the Church had appointed the whole Bible to be read over once a year, had taught his tongue not much to regard Truth: So had he also who adventured to say, pag. 23. That it is required of the people that they repeat aloud the Confession of sins; No such thing is required of the people, rather it is required that they should repeat the Confession of sins with a lowly and submissive voice; Should all lift up their voices aloud, there might be more confusion than Mr. D. is aware of.

But though I am confident Mr. D. is mistaken about the two last mentioned particulars, yet I must profess I am not clear about the Churches meaning in either of them: After order taken for the reading of the Psalms, we are thus directed, "Then shall be read distinctly with an audible voice the first Lesson taken out of the Old Testament, as is appointed in the Kalendar (*except, &c.*)

Any

Any man by this would think that the first Lesson were alway by the Kalendar appointed to be taken out of the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament ; yet the Kalendar appoints many Apocryphal Chapters to be read for the first Lesson : Is Apocrypha become a part of the Old Testament ? I know our Church had no intention to make it so, yet the Phrase used by her in a Complex Notion, sounds as if she did ; I suppose therefore she calls all Books preceding the New Testament, whether Canonical or Apocryphal by the name of the Old Testament ; If this supposition hold, than the admonition to all Ministers Ecclesiastical prefixed to the Second Book of Homilies will warrant them to change all the Chapters Apocryphal that shall fall in course to be read on every Sunday or Holiday into a Chapter of the New Testament ; for in that Admonition such Liberty is granted , or rather such course is prescribed in reference to the less edifying Chapters of the Old Testament. But perhaps by assenting and consenting to all and any thing , Ministers have given away their liberty to make any such exchange. Let those whom it concerns consider. Where I live I have little opportunity to hear Apocrypha read publickly, and if in my Family I make choice of Divinely inspired Writings

to read, I hope I am no transgressor of the Law.

Nor really do I know what is meant in our Liturgy by a loud voice; In the old Common Prayer Book after the absolution the Minister was appointed to begin the Lords Prayer with a loud voice, In the new, *loud* is changed into *audible*, and we are also required at that time to repeat it after the Minister, which was not required in the old. But now coming to look upon our directions for the rehearsing of the Lords Prayer, after the repeating of the Creed, I find that not only the Minister, but Clerks and people are appointed to say it with a loud voice. I cannot think the phrase is merely varied by Chance, nor yet do I see the Reason of the variation, nor do I observe any, either Priests or people, thus to vary by straining their voice higher at one time than another. Perhaps our last Amenders of the Liturgy did put *audible*, instead of *loud*, in some places; that we might know that voice was loud enough on the Ministers part which the people could hear; but what shall be called either an *audible* or *loud* voice on the peoples part? Are those people that kneel at one end of the Church to speak so loud as they may be heard of those who kneel at the other end, or loud enough to be heard of the

Mi-

Minister, or only loud enough to be heard of those who are next to them. Mr. D. hath had many occasions and opportunities to assent and consent to all and every thing contained and prescribed, and therefore is ignorant of none of these things; Let him be him be intreated to help us poor Ingrams; for our Countrey Priests are as unable to untie these knots as our selves.

All this I have written, not out of any dislike to those who put out their Books in the defence of the English Liturgy, for I should be right glad of the pains of any who would justify it against all the Objections with which it is pressed; provided he would do it like a Scholar and like a Christian, grounding whatever he writes upon such Reasons as are apt to move those who have Consciences, and do remember that God will bring them to a strict account for all that they do in his Worship; but Mr. D. evidently is no meet person to make our Churches defence; for he has been so highly rewarded, is so overwhelmed with Ecclesiastical Preferments, and Dignities, that the World will hardly think any thing put him upon writing besides filthy lucre. If he would have done our Church service, he should have contented himself with some one Ecclesiastical Preferment, spending himself in that,
going

going to his people, from house to house, perswading them to credit the Liturgy, by excelling all those in Virtue that used no Liturgy; he should have conjur'd them to deny all ungodliness, and worldly lusts, and to use their best wisdom so to order their affairs, as that they might have leisure to come Morning and Evening every day, and receive the benefit of their Churches Liturgy: but as the Apostle said, *That they who themselves were circumcised kept not the Law*: so we say, that they who have assented and consented, do not observe the Orders and Rules to which they have given assent and consent, nor yield that Obedience which they have sworn to yield: How few be they that Catechise half an hour every Sunday and Holiday? How few be they that have called and advertised notorious evil-livers not to approach the Lords Table, until they have truly repented and amended their naughty lives? How many have subscribed the Articles who never so much as read the Homilies that by the Articles they are to approve? I once happened into the Company of the Rectour of a Parish, who signifying to me that he had lately been with the Bishop to receive Orders from him, I asked what things were required of him in order to Ordination? He told me among other things, he had subscribed

bed the three Articles in the 36 Canon : but when I demanded of him what those Articles were, he confessed he knew not what they were, nor had he ever seen them, but followed his Leader : and not long since, one had confidence enough to come to a Reverend Minister of my acquaintance with a purpose to perswade him to Conformity ; but my Friend arguing for his Non-conformity from a very plain passage in the Liturgy, he denied that there was any such passage to be found ; and had not this man then well read and studied the Book, to which he so solemnly gave assent and consent. I profess where-ever I come, I make it my business to reconcile people to the publick Assemblies, my Conscience would fly in my face if I should do otherwise ; but I find my self unable to prevail with them through the prejudice they have taken up against the Liturgy, and their prejudices are grounded for the most part upon the wicked lives of those that are the most constant Readers and frequenters of it. I shall never upon this account cease to joyn in prayers and to hear Sermons ; but yet I rejoyce that a great Prelate lately in his Visitation openly declared in his Speech, his resolution to proceed, and deal more severely against those who should be found loose and profane, than against those that differed from him

him only in Ceremonies; The Lord give hearts to those whom it concerns, to think immorality worthy of presentment, and to set a mark upon all whose feet run into all excess of Riot, and whose Tongues are set on fire from Hell, that so we may have wherewith to stop the mouths of those who are bent upon Separation, and employ their Rhetorick in nothing more, than in perswading the people that God is departed from us: It would be a small trouble to me to find the Non-conformists disarmed, did I find the Weapons of their Warfare put into the hands of those, who would use them more, to the disadvantage of the World, Flesh, and Devil.

I have mentioned one thing that makes Mr. D. not the fittest person in the World to manage this Controversie, that is, his not being free from, at least the suspicion, of Covetousness. I will suggest one or two more: He seems to be very injudicious, and therefore puts into his Book such cold Commendations of Church and Liturgy, as do only not dispraise it. I instance only in Monsieur *Vauqueline*, whom he brings in Pag. 189. thus extolling our Liturgy, *The Book of Common Prayer is very far from any Idolatry, and there is not in it any formal Superstition.* Is not this a rare Elogium? But above all he disparages him-

himself by giving flattering Titles unto men, Pag. 87. he tells us that Monsieur *Goyen* is *as versed in Antiquity as possible*; a Commendation too high to be given to any man, and such as that Reverend persons worth will never suffer him to accept of, or so much as to commend the love of him who gave it; let any one read the Epistle Dedicatory to his Book, he will find the Lord Chancellour so highly commended, that any one may see the Commendations were rather given to his Place, than to his Virtues; all the Authority of the Nation hath lately sentenced him to Banishment, and yet Mr. *D.* could not find so much humility, as either to bewail his fault, or his unhappiness, who had bestowed such praises, in a printed letter upon him, whom the Kingdom has declared to have deserved ill of it, and of the Church too.

I may well think you will begin to say what is all this to the Latine Book that I sent you? Or how can I by all you have hitherto writ, perceive your Judgment about it? Surely, Sir, the things I have noted out of the English Book, are sufficient to let you see, that his 2^d. Book is not worth your reading; Scarcely can you find more words put together to less purpose. The very Title-Page sufficiently exposes him either to the scorn, or pity of those whom he chose for his Adversaries.

Vindicie Sacra Ecclesia Anglicana : What is this *Holy English Church* ? Does he mean that Company of men and women in *England* who exercise themselves therein, that they may be holy as God is holy : *Quis Lacedemoniorum vituperat* ? Why is this Church vindicated that no sober man ever went about to accuse ? If by the Holy Church of *England* he mean the late Convocation, then he hath written as our Episcopal men are wont to write ; and by the Canons of 1603. it is made a very dangerous point, to deny that a Convocation is the Church of *England* by Representation ; and I have no mind to try how near I can come to that danger without incurring it ; Seeing Mr. D. has professed with thankfulness, that he learned Divinity under *Amyraldus* ; he may do well to try whether he can confute his Master in his *Theses de Ecclesia nomine, ac definitione, and, de ratione convocandorum Conciliorum* ; which do not look very smilingly upon that form of Speech which we use in *England* ; or upon the way of constituting our Convocations. Mr. *Jeanes* a man of a very Scholastical Head, had called the Convocation, *The Church of England* : but in the Second part of his Divinity, he wonders upon what account he or any one else could think it to be the Church of *England* ; he instances in his own Diocess,

cess, in which there was one Dean, one Prebend, three Arch-Deacons ; whereas the whole Clergy of the Diocess chose but two ; so that he thinks our Convocations may be rather called Repræsentatives of the Bishops and Cathedrals, than of the Church of *England* : And he asks whether if the King should chuse two hundred into the House of Commons, and the people one, that Meeting could be called the Representative of the People of *England* ? Mr. D. who has used this Title should have done well to give satisfaction to such kind of Questions as these, and to have shewed us Synods in other Churches, the Major part of the Members whereof, are neither chosen by the people, nor by the Clergy ; instead of doing so, he hath left it doubtful, what he means by the Church : And it is much more doubtful to me whom he means by his Schismatics : against whose vociferations he pretends to defend his Church : When you have called a man Schismatick, you have call'd him every thing : but I believe no man in the world thinks that all those against whom he vents his spleen in this Book, deserve to be called Schismatics. I am sure according to the definition of Schisme, that is given by Dr. *Hammond*, they are not Schismatics : Mr. D. seems to thrust out his sharpest sting against Mr. *Bax-*

ter, Now it is notoriously known that he constantly went to the publick Congregation : its known also that he has in the publick Congregation received the Sacrament of the Lords Supper according to the form that is by Law established : he has Communion with the Church of *England* in all Circumstances, takes a great deal of pains to resolve the doubts of those who scruple Communion with her, and yet is in Mr. *D*'s account, one of the Heads of the Schismatics ; Let him take heed that he do not throw this dirt into such mens faces, if he do, it will fly back into his own. The Case of hundreds of Non-conformists stands thus : When they were School-boys, or Under-graduates in the University, the King called the so much talked of Long-Parliament ; in which both the *High-Commission Court*, and *Star-Chamber* were taken down ; and the High-Commission Court was taken down in words so general, as were interpreted to reach all other Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and coercive power of Church Consistories : by these two Statutes Dr. *Heylin* sayes, That the *two great Bulwarks of the Church were beaten down* ; In the same Parliament also passed an Act disabling the Bishops to sit as Members in the House of Peers ; in this condition stood things until an unhappy War was begun

gun betwixt the King and the two Houses, during the heat of which War, the two Houses Voted away the Episcopal Government established in the Nation; and Bishops, in the places where their Forces prevailed, either were not at all, or shewed not themselves; Divine Providence so ord'ed it, that the Kings Forces were at last quite overcome, and with them Bishops also were overcome; so as they no where publickly and solemnly own'd either their Power of order, or Jurisdiction: so stood affairs until that his Majesty was restored; but in the mean time young men that had applied themselves to the study of Divinity, were under necessity either by the Statutes of Collidges, or by accepting of Livings, to enter into Holy Orders, and to receive those Holy Orders from meer Presbyters; by which Orders they acted for many Years, the Lord accompanying their Ministry with great success, the people every where receiving the Eucharist at their hands, and bringing their Children also to be baptized by them; the Parliament which had the happiness to bring in the King, confirming them in their Livings; but the present Parliament hath thought meet to enact that all should be incapable of Cure of Souls that had not Episcopal Ordination; so as they finding themselves under this Dilemma

lemma, that either they must nullifie their former Orders by Re-ordination, or else quit their Livings, chose to relinquish their Benefices, & so made way to the preferment of many every way of Mr. D's own mind; He himself perhaps he had not had so many Ecclesiastical Benefices, and Dignities, could they have satisfied themselves to keep their stations; this is the Schisme of a great many of those with whom he is so angry: And can he not forgive them such a Schism which proved so beneficial to himself and others? It will be more difficult to forgive Mr. D. the Schisme that he himself endeavours to make contrary to the *Intent of the Act of Indemnity*, and *Oblivion*, by which we are commanded to bury the *Actings* of those that were indemnified in the Grave, so as not to mention them to the disparagement of any, but leave them wholly to the Judgment of the Great day; but this bitter man, as if he envied Church, and State, the Peace, and Quietness they both enjoy, will needs open the Grave of Oblivion, rake into the dust, and bring all old Stories and Transactions upon the Stage again. Would any man be like minded; how easie were it to recriminate; Who knows not that a *Primate of England*, and *Metropolitan* took up Arms in the Cause of the two Houses, and had Money

ney Voted him for his good Service? Was not the Author of *Politica Sacra & Civilia*, an Episcopal Divine? Doth he not at present Conform? Is he out of his Living, who writ the *Jus Divinum Regiminis Ecclesiastici*? If we should make search into our *Bishops, Deans, Prebends, Priests*, might we not finde such as took the Covenant themselves, and perswaded others to take it? Nay, might we not among them, even among them, find those that took the Engagement, and came into the Livings of those that were outed for not taking the Engagement? Nay, if a man would make enquiry for *Bradshaw's* Chaplains, are they not among the the Conformists? Be they not also among them who justified the Murthering of the King? And if it were allowable to Glory, how many Non-conformists had suffered deeply in the Kings Cause before Mr. D. in the Isle of *Jersey* was either banished or molested? but these are things wholly Heterogeneous to Conformity, and Non-conformity; So is also the whole series of the late War: It hath been my hap as yet to know but of four meer Non-conformists, that were aged experienced Divines at the beginning of the Warrs; and they four so far as I can learn, were all in their Judgments unsatisfied in the Parliament War; It

is

is like enough that there were many others that were satisfied in their Cause, and acted for it; But what need Mr. D. or I be solicitous about this? Does not the King understand his Supremacie? Has not the Parliament declared it unlawful upon any pretence whatsoever to take up Arms against him? After such Declaration, who is he that will dare to call the thing in Question? I do not know that since his Majesties Return any Book has been printed, asserting the Lawfulness of Subjects taking up Arms against a King, unless that which was published as Mr. *Hookers*, by Dr. *Gawden*, & dedicated to the King himself; nor do I find any English Divine, whose testimony the Writers for the Parliaments Cause did more build upon, than Bishop *Bilson*, the Great Propugner of Hierarchy, whose words it would be Treason now to transcribe. Mr. D. knows where to find them; let him take them into his consideration, and see how he can qualifie them; for my part I do not love to exercise myself in things too high for me: this I must take leave to say, That Mr. D. hath manifested himself very grossly to be a respecter of persons: for whereas he pours out contempt upon some now alive, for expressions that fell from them in a time of trouble and confusion, there is scarce one of his beyond-

See

Sea Divines, whom he does not quote with much Honour and Respect, though they did in their Systems of Divinity, and Comments on Scripture lay down the same Doctrine quarrell'd at in Mr. *Baxter*? Doth he not know what pains *David Owen* hath taken to make his honest *Calvin*, and his Learned *Beza*, and *Daneus*, &c. as guilty of delivering Trayterous Doctrine as the Jesuites themselves? At least he knows that *Paræus* his Book was appointed to be burnt at *Oxford*, and yet him he makes use of *Pag. 8th.* and *pag. 337.* &c. *Andrew Rivet* also he chooseth as a man fit to be of the Synod, and yet this *Rivet* in his Exposition on the 68 *Psal.* determines very peremptorily for the lawfulness of defensive Arms, and to the *Ephori* he allowes a liberty to take up offensive Arms. *Peter Du Moylin*, and *Spanhemius* he would also have Chieftains in his Synod, And yet these two, the one in his Anatomy of Arminianisme, the other in his *Dubia Evangelica* on *Matthew 5th* do make the Right of Civil things to belong only to the Godly, or to the Elect, then which nothing could be said more dangerous to greater or lesser Societies. I know they both distinguish of a Right in respect of men, and of a Right in respect of God, denying onely the later unto the wicked; but giving them this grain of allow-

ance, their position though well meant by them, will be found neither sound, nor safe; Let Mr. D. therefore warn those for whom he designed his Book against this Tenent; & let all men understand that the English Non-Conformists are of a quite contrary Judgment; For they say unanimously, *that all wicked men have a true Right, to all that, whether Authority or Estate, unto which they came by due and lawful means, and that God will never punish them because they had no right to the Estates they came honestly to, but because they did not use their Estates aright.* I have onely one request more to make to you, and by you to all your Friends, and it is a very reasonable one, namely, that you, and they, would rather credit the Kings Declaration concerning the English Presbyterians, than Mr. D's either English or Latine Book; This one desire being granted, the Presbyterians are as safe as an Amulet can make them.

Object. You will say, If they only suffer beyond the Seas through Mr. D's misrepresentation, why have not I so much Charity as to reply upon his Book, and make in Latin, as once Mr. Nichols did in English, a Plea for the Innocent?

Ans.

Ans/w. Truly Sir, because I have found by Observation that it is in vain to disarm him, who hath a Panoply in the very next Dunghil to which he comes, there is no dealing with him; who,

First, Will deny matters of fact without Reason.

Secondly, Will not take notice of the true state of the Controversie.

Thirdly, Will never yield though he have nothing to say for himself. Such an one is Mr. D. For if you look into his Book, you will find him charging the Apologist with Fables and Legends, that is, in plain English, giving him the Lye, and yet never giving the least Reason to perswade the World that the things written by him were false. He calls it a Fable that any man should be reported to give Counsel & advise to have the surplice after it was worn out, burnt to ashes, the Ashes put into an Urn, & buried under the Altar; and yet this very thing I have heard strongly and stoutly asserted by more than one Conformist, who if need require would not be ashamed to testify it publickly. Also he would have it a Fable that a man who had threatned a Minister for not reading the Common Prayer, should being sick send for him, and desire him to pray for him, not making use of the Common-Pray-

er; but this as it was long since Printed by *Giles Firmin*, so it will be verified when he pleases. That Bishop *Saunderson* should desire to have Prayers read him out of the whole Duty of Man, he would also have to be a Fable; but the Chaplain who read them, told me and others so, and I suppose is too honest a man to deny what he said before so many.

As for his not taking notice of the true state of any Controversie, I refer you to his Book to what part or parcel soever of it, you shall please to chuse: If I mistake not, very near his Conclusion, he has a Chap. with this Title, *Whether Calvin more favoured Schismatical Presbyterians, or Prelates?* Can you think that ever there was such a Controversie on foot in *England*? Did any one offer to say, that *Calvin* had favourable thoughts of Schismatics? The Question is, whether *Calvin* ever thought Prelacy to be by Divine appointment, an Order Superiour to Presbytery? And whether he would have all those thrown out of the Ministry, who cannot acknowledge it so to be; if any thing of *Calvins* be by Mr. D. brought to this purpose, then will I have a quarrel against him that first taught me to construe Latine: Take another instance, the Apologist had wondered that the Non-Conformists were put upon pro-

promising, *That they would read the Psalter according to the Old English Translation, when as we have in our Bibles a New one that is much better*: he instanced in a few odd and uncouth Translations; Now what does Mr. D. upon this? Why, he asks whether if the Translation be corrupt a man ought rather to forsake his Ministry than to read a corrupt Translation; as if the Nonconformists had had nothing required of them but only to read the old Translation of the Psalms; Yet I confess all these things would not discourage me from taking him to task, had I any hopes that he had not taught his forehead not to blush, but who would shoot at him that is become unpenetrable? I will tell you one Story: Mr. D. in the presence of a Noble Person of this Nation, said, *That all the French Ministers disowned the Presbyterian Non Conformists in England*: that Honourable person presently replied, *To my knowledge that is not so, Nay, Some of the French Ministers look upon you as a kind of Apostate for doing what you have done here in England.* Mr. D. replying, *They be onely some few hot-headed men that so think*: it was presently returned by the same Noble Person, *Nay, the men that think so are very Reverend and worthy Divines.* Yet our Vindex never changed the Copy of his Countenance, and
what

what then can you think is to be done with such a man? Besides he hath abused Dr. *Manton*, the Author of the Comment upon *James* and *Jude*; and Mr. *Baxter* the Author of the *Saints Everlasting Rest*, and of the *Learned Discourse against Atheisme and Infidelity*: and which will render him more odious beyond the Seas, he hath most shamefully abused Mr. *Gataker*, than whom *England* hath not had a more Learned Critick, or profound Divine: nor doth he spare the gray-hairs of old *Gisbert Voet*, the only surviving Member of the Venerable the Synod of *Dort*; and he that shall dare to touch such as these, will not long want a man that shall let him know, *quid distent ara lupinis*.

For your part, my Worthy Friend, all you can desire of me in requital of your Civility is but this, that I declare my self ready (as by these presents I do) to remove any scruple that is left in you by the reading of that grand Volumne; send me that passage in which you think Mr. *D.* hath the Non-conformists at the greatest disadvantage; If I do not return you a sudden and satisfactory answer, then say I have not judged fairly and candidly concerning your Author. If you are not at leisure to take this pains, employ our worthy friend *S. E.* who

is

is grown sufficiently zealous for Conformity, through whose Pen Mr. D. to be sure will suffer no disadvantage : Let him cull out the very best Argument in all this *Vindex* his Book, if I do not forthwith reply to it, and that rationally (provided the Argument be directed against the Cause, and not against particular Persons) I will then set a Seal upon my Lips, so as never more to plead in done, you of Non-Conformity ; till that be the behalf will give me leave to remain, what I am

A peaceable desirer of some indulgence for those whom I never found to be humour some, but Conscientious, and

Your humble Servant,

W. B.
